

Agenda Book  
**EPSB Meeting Agenda**  
**EPSB Offices, 100 Airport Road, Frankfort, KY 40601**  
**January 26, 2009**

**Monday, January 26, 2009**

**9:00 AM EST      Call to Order**

**Recognition of Former Board Member**

**Roll Call**

**[Approval of November 17, 2008 Minutes](#) (Pages 1-18)**

**Open Speak**

**Report of the Executive Director**

- A. Report from the Kentucky Department of Education
- B. Report from the Council on Postsecondary Education
- C. Local Educator Assignment Data (LEAD) Report Update  
(Mr. Mike Carr)
- D. Legislative Update (Ms. Alicia Sneed)

**Report of the Chair**

Reappointments to the Accreditation Audit Committee (AAC)

New Appointments and Reappointments to the Reading Committee

**Committee Reports**

**Information/Discussion Items**

- A. [16 KAR 8:030. Continuing Education Option for Certificate Renewal and Rank Change, Notice of Intent](#) (Mr. Robert Brown)  
(Pages 19-36)
- B. [Awarded Contracts](#) (Mr. Gary Freeland) (Pages 37-38)
- C. [Mid-Year Budget Report](#) (Mr. Freeland) (Pages 39-40)
- D. [Implementation Plan of Math Task Force Recommendations](#)  
(Dr. Marilyn Troupe) (Pages 41-48)
- E. [Certification Task Force Recommendations](#) (Mr. Mike Carr)  
(Pages 49-56)

**Action Items**

- A. [16 KAR 5:010. Standards for Accreditation of Educator Preparation Units and Approval of Programs, Final Action](#)  
(Pages 57-108) (Dr. Troupe)

## Agenda Book

### **Waiver**

[16 KAR 5:010. Request to Waive Language Pertaining to Continuing Education Visits Every 7 Years](#) (Dr. Troupe)  
(Pages 109-113)

### **Board Comments**

*Following a motion in open session, it is anticipated that the board will move into closed session as provided by KRS 61.810 (1)(c) and (1)(j).*

### **Certification Review and Revocation: Pending Litigation Review**

*Following review of pending litigation, the board shall move into open session. All decisions will be made in open session.*

### **Adjournment**

Next Regular Meeting:  
March 16, 2009  
EPSB Offices

## Agenda Book

*The actions delineated below were taken in open session of the EPSB at the November 17, 2008 regular meeting. This information is provided in summary form; an official record of the meeting is available in the permanent records of the Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB), 100 Airport Road, 3rd Floor, Frankfort, KY 40601*

### **Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) Summary Minutes of the Business Meeting EPSB Offices, 100 Airport Road, 3rd Floor Frankfort, Kentucky November 17, 2008**

#### **Call to Order**

Chair Lorraine Williams convened the November 17, 2008 meeting at 9:10 a.m. (EDT).

#### **Swearing-In and Introduction of New Board Members**

Notary Public Ashley Abshire swore in new board members Laranna “Lynn” May and James Hughley.

Ms. May introduced herself to the board. A mother of 5, she is a secondary science teacher in Carter County. She expressed her love for the teaching profession and appreciation for the opportunity to serve on the board.

Next Mr. Hughley introduced himself to the board. Originally in the military, he made a career change for the opportunity to teach children. He recently moved from the middle school to a high school setting. Dr. Rogers commented that Mr. Hughley is the first EPSB board member to go through an alternative route program.

Chair Williams also introduced and welcomed the EPSB’s new board attorney, Ms. Angela Evans. Ms. Evans expressed her pleasure to work with the board.

#### **Roll Call**

The following members were present: Lonnie Anderson, Frank Cheatham, Michael Dailey, John DeAtley, Sam Evans, Cathy Gunn, Mary Hammons, James Hughley, Lynn May, Greg Ross, Sandy Sinclair-Curry, Zenaida Smith, Bobbie Stoess, Tom Stull, Lorraine Williams, and Cynthia York. Rebecca Goss was absent.

#### **Approval of September 22, 2008 EPSB Meeting Minutes**

*Motion made by Dr. Frank Cheatham, seconded by Ms. Zenaida Smith, to approve the minutes of the September 22, 2008 EPSB board meeting.*

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

#### **Amendment of November 17, 2008 EPSB Agenda**

*Motion made by Ms. Cynthia York, seconded by Mr. Lonnie Anderson, to amend the November 17, 2008 board agenda to add Action Item, Waiver D. 16 KAR 7:010. Request to Waive Language Pertaining to the Submission of the Cycle III Report by May 1, Franklin Independent and Action Item, Waiver E. 16 KAR 7:010. Request to Waive Language Pertaining to the Submission of the Cycle III Report by May 1, Fayette County Public Schools.*

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

### **Open Speak**

Ms. Jamie England addressed the board regarding action item, waiver B on the agenda pertaining to requirements for Rank II. She asked the board to consider certification for adult education.

### **Report of the Executive Director**

Dr. Marilyn Troupe introduced Mr. Anthony Campbell, educator preparation's new administrative program consultant. With experience as an adjunct professor and technical writer, Mr. Campbell brings an array of skills to the EPSB. His educational background includes a Bachelor of Science in English Education, Master of Arts in English, and a Master of Science in Information Technology with further doctoral work in English.

#### Report from the Kentucky Department of Education

Mr. Michael Dailey reported on the recent work of KDE.

\* Commissioner Draud is still recovering from a minor stroke but is eager to begin working full-time within the next month.

\* Dr. Draud addressed the state Future Educators Association conference, which was held on November 12<sup>th</sup> & 13<sup>th</sup> in Louisville. In his remarks to the approximately 1200 students in attendance, he emphasized the importance of recruiting capable and highly qualified educators.

\*The Assessment and Accountability Task Force continues to move forward with its work.

#### Report from the Council on Postsecondary Education

Mr. John DeAtley reported that CPE continues searching for a new president and anticipates naming someone by year's end. He further reported that on January 15, 2009, the Governor's Higher Education Work Group will be issuing its first report, suggesting ideas to reduce college costs. The work group anticipates developing a report by September for the 2010 legislative session. Additionally, Mr. DeAtley reported that at the January 2009 CPE meeting, staff plans to recommend moving the effective date of the developmental education regulation from fall 2009 to fall 2010 due to the current financial situation.

### **Report of the Chair**

#### Appointment to the Kentucky Advisory Council on Internships (KACI)

Chair Lorraine Williams appointed Dr. Stephen Fardo to the Kentucky Advisory Council on Internships.

## **Committee Reports**

### **KTIP Task Force**

Mr. Robert Brown reported that the KTIP Task Force met in late October and discussed potential changes to KTIP.

Different roles for the KTIP committee members were discussed during this meeting. For instance, one change under consideration was that the principal serve as the sole evaluator and the resource teacher (RT) serve only as a mentor. Currently the resource teacher (RT) serves in a dual role of mentor and evaluator. The committee also considered removing teacher educators (TEs) from most of the KTIP committees.

The task force also examined the required hours on the KTIP committee. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) could count up to 40 hours, and 10 hours could be individualized for observations, post-observations, and the development of the professional growth plan (PGP). RTs would work collaboratively with the intern through the PGP to identify the use of 20 hours in-class time.

Additional changes under consideration include the following: 1) Change the language for those out-of-state teachers required to enter KTIP from “less than 2 years of experience to “less than 1 year of experience.” 2) Provide for a system of train-the-trainers, allowing for more district involvement in KTIP training. 3) Provide via video a quality control mechanism for all training. Videos would be randomly selected for submission to the EPSB staff for review.

Dr. Sam Evans stated his belief that a PLC is a good idea; however, he expressed concern that the university is largely being removed from the KTIP committee, weakening the partnership that education stakeholders have tried to strengthen. He encouraged the task force to look at all aspects of KTIP and not let funding be a determining factor for changes. Dr. Frank Cheatham emphasized the importance of keeping universities as involved in KTIP as possible. Mr. Greg Ross expressed concern about having the principal serve as the sole evaluator of the committee.

Mr. Brown plans to notify the task force of the board’s suggestions, comments, and concerns at the next KTIP task force meeting on December 4<sup>th</sup>.

### **Evaluation of the Executive Director**

Dr. Sam Evans distributed the executive director evaluation documents to the board. Approximately half of the staff and board members completed an evaluation for Dr. Rogers. Dr. Rogers asked the board to vote on his evaluation as early as possible to streamline the process.

The board plans to write an evaluation letter to Dr. Rogers. It was discussed that an affirmation of support and agreement that all goals have been met should be included in the document.

*Motion made by Mr. Greg Ross, seconded by Ms. Bobbie Stoess, to give a satisfactory evaluation for Dr. Rogers for the 2008 evaluation year.*

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

## Agenda Book

*Motion made by Mr. Lonnie Anderson, seconded by Mr. DeAtley, to accept Dr. Rogers' request that due to the current budget crisis his scheduled 1% raise be deferred for FY 2009.*

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

### **Information/Discussion Items**

#### 16 KAR 5:010. Standards for Accreditation of Educator Preparation Units and Approval of Programs, Notice of Intent

Dr. Marilyn Troupe reported on proposed changes to 16 KAR 5:010. Currently the EPSB reimburses all state board of examiners (BOE) members through agency operational funds allocated by the General Assembly. An EPSB survey of 30 states revealed that Kentucky is one of seven states that bear the travel expenses for members of a state BOE team to participate in an institution's accreditation review. EPSB staff proposed to amend section 16 of 16 KAR 5:010 to require the educator preparation institution instead of the EPSB to reimburse a state team member for travel, lodging, and meals. This item will be brought back for final action at the January EPSB meeting.

#### Union College: Report of Accreditation Issues

At the May 19, 2008 meeting of the EPSB, the board granted continuing accreditation with probation to the educator preparation unit at Union College. The board decision included a stipulation that Union College report back to the EPSB in 6 months on progress made toward improvement, with the understanding that Union College shall undergo a program review within two years. The college reported *at the board's* request, and Dr. Lou Ann Hopper and Ms. Tanlee Wasson were available for board questions.

Dr. Hopper thanked the board for helping Union College become stronger. She emphasized that faculty have worked evenings and weekends and held retreats to collaborate and determine how to improve its program. An outside consultant was also hired to assist with changes.

Dr. Evans encouraged the Union College representatives to be mindful of their responses submitted to the Accreditation Audit Committee in the progress report and gave some examples where changes/additions should be made. Another progress report will be given to the EPSB in 6 months.

#### Awarded Contracts

Deputy Executive Director Gary Freeland reported on the following amendments to contracts. 1) A total of \$49,500 has been awarded to universities for the KTIP program to provide additional separate funding to support the teacher educators for Career and Technical Education interns only. 2) A total of \$31,404.78 was added to two university contracts for the KTIP program to provide additional funds to cover FY 2008 KTIP expenditures. 3) An additional \$19,050.00 was allotted to two school district contracts for National Board mentoring services.

Mr. Freeland also explained that an RFP was issued recently for development services and coaching to support the *KyEducators.org* website. The RFP was closed without awarding a contract because after careful consideration, leadership decided that

## Agenda Book

development work or technology enhancements would not be needed for this website in the near future.

### **Action Items**

#### Approval of Contracts

*Motion made by Mr. John DeAtley, seconded by Ms. Zenaida Smith, to authorize the executive director to enter into all of the contracts awarded from the National Board Request for Application.*

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

#### Math Task Force Recommendations

Dr. Troupe requested that the following individuals be added to the task force membership list: Melanie Curlin, Linda Klembara, Leslie Robertson, and Brenda Scruggs. An implementation plan for the recommendations will be presented at the January 2009 board meeting.

*Motion made by Dr. Sam Evans, seconded by Ms. Smith, to approve the Mathematics Task Force recommendations for elementary education teachers.*

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

#### Boyce College: Letter of Intent to be Recognized as a Kentucky Educator Preparation Institution to Offer Elementary and Music Education Programs

Dr. Troupe advised that Boyce College petitioned the board for approval to begin the accreditation process and to offer elementary and music education programs. Dr. Alvin Hickey discussed the college's unique mission to supply qualified and certified educators to Southern Baptist and other private Christian schools, as well to supply qualified teachers for the foreign mission fields. Some members of the board expressed their concern that there are not enough jobs to employ the vast number of elementary teachers in Kentucky and adding another institution to prepare elementary students may increase the problem.

*Motion made by Mr. DeAtley, seconded by Mr. Tom Stull, to grant Boyce College's request to pursue accreditation as a Kentucky institution and offer Elementary and Music Education Programs.*

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

#### 2009 Legislative Agenda

*Motion made by Mr. Stull, seconded by Ms. Smith, to approve the proposed 2009 Legislative Agenda as follows: amend sections of KRS 161.030 pertaining to the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program to allow the Education Professional Standards Board to modify the requirements of the program to reflect current research and the best practices of the profession, oppose any attempt to dilute or modify the current authority of the EPSB, and support any legislation which further supports the EPSB's mission and goals.*

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

16 KAR 6:010. Written Examination Prerequisites for Teacher Certification, Amendment, Final Action

**Issue 1:** *Motion made by Dr. Cathy Gunn, seconded by Ms. Cynthia York, to amend 16 KAR 6:010 to reflect the current name of the School Psychologist (0401) test required for school psychologist certifications and to provide consistency in capitalization, spacing, and punctuation throughout.*

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

**Issue 2:** Dr. Evans advised that he had recently been informed that the Gifted Education test has incorrect answers and therefore should be updated before board approval. Mr. Robert Brown stated that he was not notified during the 2008 review panels and Standard Setting Studies of any discrepancies. Ms. Alicia Sneed stated that ETS would be liable if there were wrong answers on the test, and issues regarding accuracy would be handled internally by ETS. The board would not be liable.

*Motion made by Mr. Gregory Ross, seconded by Ms. Bobbie Stoess, to amend 16 KAR 6:010 to change the cut scores of three existing tests and establish requirements for two additional tests, i.e. IECE (0023) and Gifted Education (0357).*

**Vote:** *Yes – 14*

*No– 2 (Dr. Evans, Ms. Mary Hammons)*

**Issue 3:** *Motion made by Mr. DeAtley, seconded by Dr. Gunn, to amend 16 KAR 6:010 to reflect the rescaled test code and score for the Praxis II tests Family and Consumer Sciences (0121) – 162 and School Psychologist (0401)-161.*

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

*Motion made by Mr. Michael Dailey, seconded by Mr. Lonnie Anderson, to authorize Ms. Alicia Sneed to make any necessary non-substantive changes to any proposed regulation amendment or new regulation as may be required by LRC.*

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

**Waivers**

16 KAR 7:010. Request to Waive Language Pertaining to the Submission of the Cycle III Report by May 1

*Motion made by Mr. Dailey, seconded by Mr. Anderson, to waive language in 16 KAR 7:010 to allow EPSB staff to work with districts that need an extension to the Cycle III deadline.*

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

## Agenda Book

### 16 KAR 6:010. Request to Waive Middle School (5-9) English and Communications and Secondary English Certification Assessment Requirements

*Motion made by Ms. Smith, seconded by Dr. Gunn, to accept the Illinois Certification Testing System (ICTS) tests 103 Assessment Professional Teaching (APT): 6-12 and 111 English Language Arts in lieu of the Praxis II tests:*

\*Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 5-9 (0523) *and/or*

\*Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT): Grades 7-12 (0524)

\*English Language, Literature, and Composition: Content Knowledge (0041) *but not in lieu of the Praxis II tests:*

\*Middle School English Language Arts (0049)

\*English Language, Literature, & Composition: Essays (0042).

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

### 16 KAR 8:020. Requirements for Rank II, Ms. Jamie England

*Motion made by Mr. DeAtley, seconded by Ms. Smith, to deny the waiver request for Ms. Jamie England.*

**Vote:** *Yes-15*

*Recuse-1 (Dr. Evans)*

### 16 KAR 5:040. Waiver of the Cooperating Teacher Eligibility Requirements

*Motion made by Mr. Tom Stull, seconded by Ms. Smith, to waive requirements for cooperating teachers who do not meet 16 KAR 5:040, Section 2 (d) until such a time as the board can amend the regulation.*

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

### **Board Comments**

The board had no further comments.

## **DISCIPLINARY MATTERS: MINUTES OF CASE REVIEW November 17, 2008**

*Motion made by Mr. John DeAtley, seconded by Ms. Cynthia York, to go into closed session for the purpose of discussing proposed or pending litigation in accordance with KRS 61.810(1) (c) & (j).*

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

*Motion made by Dr. Sam Evans, seconded by Ms. Bobbie Stoess, to return to open session.*

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

## Agenda Book

The following board members concurred with the actions as listed below with the noted exceptions:

Tom Stull, Sam Evans, Greg Ross, Lorraine Williams, Cathy Gunn, Cynthia York, Lonnie Anderson, John DeAtley, Mary Hammons, Sandra Sinclair-Curry, James Hughley, and Michael Dailey.

Attorneys present were Alicia A. Sneed, Gary A. Stephens, and Angela Evans.

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

### INITIAL CASE REVIEW

<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Decision</u>
0805822	Defer
0805852	Admonish
0808978	Admonish
0808962	Hear
0808994	Hear
08091024	Hear
08091002	Admonish
0808969	Admonish
0808973	Hear
08010254	Admonish
0808958	Hear
08091026	Hear
07122663	Hear
08091016	Hear
0808964	Hear
0808998	Admonish
0808990	Hear
08091008	Defer
0808980	Hear
0808967	Hear
0808975	Defer for proof
08091040	Hear
08010088	Dismiss
07-0464	Dismiss
0805821	Dismiss
08020637	Hear
0805824	Dismiss
07112315	Dismiss
0805856	Dismiss

**Character/Fitness Review**

<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Decision</u>
081293	Approve
081299	Approve
081300	Approve
081295	Approve
081253	Approve
081306	Approve
081305	Approve
081269	Approve
081314	Approve
081308	Approve
081326	Approve
081347	Approve
081353	Approve
081290	Approve
081360	Approve
081357	Approve
081289	Approve
081365	Approve
081366	Approve
081369	Approve

**Agreed Orders**

<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Decision</u>
07111525 (Perry Haeberlein)	<p>Accept Agreed Order admonishing Respondent for making inappropriate sexual and drug-related references to students. The Board reminds Respondent that as a teacher in the Commonwealth of Kentucky, he has a duty to maintain the dignity and integrity of the profession and shall not engage in any sexual related behavior with students, including making sexual jokes and sexual remarks. The Board will not tolerate any further incidents of misconduct from Respondent.</p> <p>This settlement agreement is expressly conditioned upon the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Respondent shall complete a professional development/training in the area of ethics.</li> <li>2. Respondent shall complete a sexual harassment awareness training course. All training must be approved by the Board. Respondent must provide written proof to the Board that he has completed the</li> </ol>

## Agenda Book

training by September 1, 2009. Any expense incurred for said training shall be paid by Respondent. Respondent agrees that should he fail to satisfy the above condition, his certificate shall be automatically suspended until he provides written proof to the Board that he has completed the conditions.

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

04-12142 (Donna Slaughter) Accept Agreed Order admonishing Respondent as follows: Teachers are charged with protecting the health, welfare and safety of their students which includes reporting any cases of suspected abuse. It also includes maintaining consistent supervision of students through the school day. A failure to report suspected abuse of a student and leaving a student without adult supervision are violations of these duties. The Board will not tolerate misconduct of this nature by Respondent.

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

06-07198 (Samantha Ragland) Accept Agreed Order suspending Respondent's Emergency Substitute Certificate for a period of ten (10) days from the date of acceptance of this Order by the Board. During the ten (10) day suspension period, Respondent shall neither apply for, nor be issued, a teaching certificate in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Respondent shall surrender the original certificate and all copies to EPSB, by hand-delivery or mailing to 100 Airport Road, 3rd Floor, Frankfort, Kentucky, 40601. In addition to any educational requirements, re-issuance of Respondent's teaching certificate, at the conclusion of the ten (10) day period, is expressly conditioned upon Respondent providing written evidence to the Board that she has completed twelve (12) hours of ethics training. Any expense for required training shall be born by the Respondent. Failure to meet this condition will result in Respondent being denied re-issuance of a Kentucky teaching certificate at the conclusion of the ten (10) day period. Upon reinstatement, Respondent's certificate, and any future endorsements or new areas of certification, shall be subject to the following probationary conditions for a period of two (2) years from the date of issuance:

## Agenda Book

1. Respondent shall receive no further disciplinary action by any school district in the United States including, but not limited to, admonishment, reprimand, suspension or termination. By entering into this Agreed Order, Respondent agrees that should she fail to satisfy any of these conditions during the probationary period, her certificate shall be automatically suspended for an additional period of one (1) year. If applicable, at the conclusion of the one year suspension, Respondent's certificate shall remain suspended until such time as the probationary conditions are met. Respondent is aware that should she violate KRS 161.120, either during or following this two (2) year period of probation, the Board shall initiate new disciplinary action and seek additional sanctions.

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

06-06179 (Larry Reid)

Accept Agreed Order admonishing Respondent for relying, while Superintendent of Murray Independent Schools, on the Director of Pupil Personnel to properly prepare, disseminate, and file student enrollment information both with the District and third parties, including Calloway County and KDE. While the Board understands that Respondent individually believed the enrollment information correctly and properly reported the number of Calloway County students attending schools in the Murray Independent School District, as Superintendent, he was ultimately responsible for the error. A Superintendent must not only abide by all applicable school laws and regulations, but also put policies and practices in place to make certain that those in his employ do so as well.

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

06-0369 (Jeremy Stephens)

Accept Agreed Order revoking Respondent's certificate for a period of five (5) years from the date this order is approved by the Board. Upon acceptance of this agreement by the Board, Respondent shall immediately surrender the original certificate and all copies of his certificate to the EPSB, by delivering or mailing them to 100 Airport Road, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601. In addition to any educational requirements, issuance

## Agenda Book

of a Kentucky teaching or administrative certificate to Respondent, or on his behalf, at the conclusion of the five (5) year revocation period is expressly conditioned upon Respondent providing written evidence to the Board, at the time of application, that he has complied with the following:

Respondent shall complete twelve (12) hours of professional development/training in the area of ethics as approved by the Board. Any expense incurred for the program shall be paid by Respondent. Respondent shall also comply with any and all probationary requirements in Ohio Circuit Court case number 06-CR-00075. Upon application for certification after the five (5) year revocation period, Respondent shall submit written proof from Ohio Circuit Court that he successfully completed his probation.

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

06-0228 (Nathan Underwood)Accept Agreed Order admonishing Respondent for conduct unbecoming a teacher. While it appears that there was no sexual contact between Respondent and a student, Respondent should be aware that, as an educator, he must maintain an appropriate level of professionalism with students at all times. A teacher must never go on a date with a student. The Board will tolerate no further acts of misconduct from Respondent. In addition, Respondent's teaching certificate shall be subject to the following probationary conditions for a period of three (3) years from the date of acceptance of this Order by the Board. 1. By August 1, 2009, Respondent shall provide written proof to the Board that he has completed twelve (12) hours of professional development/training in the area of ethics as approved by the Board. 2. Respondent shall receive no disciplinary action from any school district in which he is employed. "Disciplinary action" is defined as any admonishment/reprimand, suspension, or termination issued by any school district in the Commonwealth of Kentucky and upheld, if requested, by either the tribunal and/or arbitration process. Should Respondent violate any of these conditions, his certificate and any and all endorsements shall be automatically suspended for a period of five (5) years and subject to additional disciplinary sanctions pursuant to KRS 161.120.

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

## Agenda Book

date of acceptance of this Order by the Board. During the three (3) year revocation period, Respondent shall neither apply for, nor be issued, a teaching certificate in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Respondent shall surrender the original certificate and all copies to EPSB, by hand-delivery or mailing to 100 Airport Road, 3rd Floor, Frankfort, Kentucky, 40601.

In addition to any educational requirements, re-issuance of Respondent's teaching certificate at the conclusion of the three (3) year period is expressly conditioned upon Respondent providing written evidence to the Board that she has complied with the following:

1. Respondent shall complete twelve (12) hours of ethics training. Any expense for required training shall be born by the Respondent.
2. With her application for re-issuance, Respondent shall supply the Board with a current national and state criminal background check. Any expense for the criminal background check shall be born by the Respondent.
3. With her application for re-issuance, Respondent shall supply to the Board letters of recommendation from two (2) educators with current Kentucky certification in good standing in which the educators attest that Respondent is morally and ethically fit to hold a teaching certificate.

Failure to meet any of the above conditions will result in Respondent being denied re-issuance of a Kentucky teaching certificate at the conclusion of the three (3) year period.

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

07-0341 (Salvador Muniz) Accept Agreed Order dismissing case number 07-0341 on the following condition. On or before December 1, 2008, Respondent shall present written proof to the Board that he has completed all conditions ordered in Woodford District Court Case Number 07-M-00054 and that the Court has dismissed the case. If Respondent fails to satisfy this condition, his certificate shall be automatically suspended and remain so until this condition is met.

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

## Agenda Book

- 07-0229 (Lindy Forbes) Accept Agreed Order which states that the Board reminds Respondent that a teacher must maintain a professional approach with students and must be mindful of her duty to parents under the Professional Code of Ethics. Although the Board finds no malice in Respondent's actions and recognizes that Respondent's intention was to protect the confidence of a student, the Board notes that teachers have a duty to communicate information to parents which should be revealed in the interest of the student. If a similar situation occurs in the future, Respondent shall either inform the parents or seek assistance from school officials if informing the parents may place the student at risk of harm.

**Vote:** *Unanimous (Ms. York, recused)*

- 08010085 (Dewayne Reinhardt) Accept Agreed Order which provides for the following:

1. Respondent's certificate is retroactively suspended from December 1, 2007 through March 29, 2008, a period of one hundred twenty (120) days. Upon acceptance of this agreement by the Board, Respondent shall immediately surrender the original and all copies of his certificate to the EPSB, by delivering or mailing to 100 Airport Road, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601, so that the retroactive suspension can be noted on Respondent's original certificate and any copies.
2. Respondent shall be placed on probation for a period of two (2) years beginning on the date the Board approves this Agreed Order. Should Respondent be convicted of a felony or a misdemeanor in which his wife is the complaining witness/victim during the period of probation, Respondent's certificate and all endorsements shall immediately be suspended for a period of two (2) years, and the Board reserves the right to seek additional sanctions.

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

- 0803656 (Gregory Nichols) Accept Agreed Order which provides for the following:

1. The Board admonishes Respondent that inappropriate use of technology will not be tolerated. Viewing inappropriate material on a

## Agenda Book

school computer damages the dignity and integrity of the teaching profession.

2. Respondent's certificate, including any and all endorsements, is retroactively suspended for three (3) days (March 5 through March 7, 2008). Upon acceptance of this agreement by the Board, Respondent shall immediately surrender the original and all copies of his certificate to the EPSB, by delivering or mailing to 100 Airport Road, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601, so that the retroactive suspension can be marked on his certificate.

3. For three (3) years from the date the Board approves this Agreed Order, Respondent shall receive no disciplinary action for inappropriate use of technology from any school district in which he is employed. "Disciplinary action" is defined as any admonishment/reprimand, suspension, or termination issued by any school district in the Commonwealth of Kentucky and upheld, if requested, by either the tribunal and/or arbitration process. Should Respondent violate this condition, his certificate shall be automatically suspended for one (1) year, and the Board may initiate new disciplinary action and seek additional sanctions.

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

06-05111 (Joseph Chappell) Accept Agreed Order admonishing Respondent for his failure to manage student behavior in an appropriate manner. As a teacher, it is Respondent's responsibility to maintain a safe and positive learning environment at all times. He must make every effort to protect the health, welfare and safety of those in his care. This agreement is conditioned upon Respondent providing written proof to the Board, on or before April 15, 2009, that he has completed six hours of professional development/training in the area of appropriate behavior management techniques, approved by the Board and at his own expense. Respondent agrees that should he fail to satisfy this condition, his certificate shall be automatically suspended and remain so until he provides written proof to the Board that the condition is met.

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

## Agenda Book

- 07122803 (Amy Danzo) Accept Agreed Order admonishing Respondent for exchanging personal text messages with a minor volunteering in her school. As a counselor and education professional, it is Respondent's responsibility to set and maintain appropriate boundaries with all students and minors she encounters both in and out of the school setting. This agreement is conditioned upon Respondent providing, on or before March 1, 2009, written evidence to the Board that she has successfully completed twelve hours of professional development/training, approved by the Board, in appropriate teacher/student relationships and/or boundary issues and ethics. Any expense for this professional development/training shall be paid by Respondent. If Respondent fails to satisfy this condition, her certificate shall be automatically suspended until this condition is met.
- Vote:** *Unanimous*
- 06-0484 (Mack Lacey) Accept Agreed Order suspending Respondent's certificate for a period of four days beginning April 14, 2006. Respondent shall surrender the original and all copies of his certificate immediately, by first class mail or personal delivery to the Education Professional Standards Board, 100 Airport Road, Third Floor, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601. This agreement is conditioned upon Respondent providing written proof to the Board, on or before January 15, 2009, that he has completed six hours of professional development/training in the area of appropriate behavior management techniques, approved by the Board and at his own expense. Respondent agrees that should he fail to satisfy this condition, his certificate shall be automatically suspended and remain so until he provides written proof to the Board that the condition is met.
- Vote:** *Unanimous*
- 04-0568 (Cassandra Webb) Accept Agreed Order which provides for the following: Respondent agrees to complete professional development/training regarding the Accounting Procedures for Kentucky School Activity funds, commonly known as "Redbook" as approved by the Board. Any expenses incurred for the training shall be paid by Respondent.

Agenda Book

Respondent has supplied proof of completion of the required training to the Board, therefore upon acceptance of this order by the Board, Case #04-0568 will be dismissed.

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

*Motion made by Ms. Stoess, seconded by Dr. Evans, to adjourn the meeting.*

**Vote:** *Unanimous*

Meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Next Meeting: January 26, 2009  
9:00 AM  
EPSB Board Room  
Frankfort, Kentucky

Agenda Book  
**EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD  
STAFF NOTE**

**Information/Discussion Item A**

**Information Item:**

16 KAR 8:030. Continuing Education Option, Amendment, Notice of Intent

**Applicable Statutes and Regulation:**

KRS 161.020, 161.028, 161.030, 161.095, 161.1211  
16 KAR 8:030

**Applicable Goal:**

Goal III: A properly credentialed person shall staff every professional position in Kentucky's public schools.

**Background:**

During its November 19, 2007 meeting, the EPSB suspended the Continuing Education Option (CEO) for rank change pending redesign of the program that would incorporate omitted components, provide rigor to existing components of the plan, and become cost effective as a self-supporting program through candidate participation.

The EPSB appointed a CEO Task Force to research and design a CEO program aligned with the Kentucky Teacher Standards Advanced Level Performances. Members of the task force included representation from local school districts, private schools, universities, and EPSB staff. The last meeting of the CEO Task Force occurred on December 1, 2008, to discuss recommendations to the EPSB. Recommendations from this meeting include the following:

**Recommendation I: Completion of the four phases of the Continuing Education Option**

Phase 1: Job-Embedded Professional Learning Plan that focuses on a professional growth need identified by the teacher with considerations given to the needs identified in the school's growth plan, student assessment results, and community resources. Within the plan the teacher develops the proposals for the remaining phases of the CEO: the leadership project, the area of concentration for *Take One!*, the action research project, the instructional unit, and the university course work. The components of the plan must align with the ten (10) Kentucky Teacher Standards Advanced Level Performances.

Phase 2: Content Reading and Research that consists of the completion of the action research project established during the development of the job-embedded professional growth plan as described in the online module of Phase 1. The graduate course work, leadership plan, and *Take One!* are initiated during this phase.

Phase 3: Classroom Implementation and Student Assessment that consists of the instructional unit, reflection, and refinement based upon student achievement data as described in the job-embedded professional development plan. The graduate course work, leadership plan, and *Take One!* are completed during this phase.

Phase 4: Professional Demonstration and Publication that consists of evidence of public demonstration of all Portfolio components as defined in Phases 1 through 3. Evidence of all components of Phases 1 through 4 that are presented during the public demonstration is provided in the CEO portfolio and submitted for final scoring.

### **Recommendation II: Inclusion of graduate level course work**

The task force discussed requiring a minimum of six (6) credit hours of university course work. There was no general agreement among the members whether this should be graduate course work, or if undergraduate course work would suffice. As no final conclusions could be made, the task force agreed to bring this topic to the Board for discussion before final recommendation. Graduate course work is initiated after plan approval. Evidence of successful completion of the course work is provided in the CEO portfolio.

### **Recommendation III: Inclusion of *Take One!***

To increase the rigor and to allow for a natural progression into the NBPTS process, the task force recommends that candidates complete *Take One!* This program is designed to be a job-embedded, ongoing professional development experience that helps build learning communities in schools and strengthens professional collaboration among educators. The score a teacher receives from *Take One!* may be banked to meet one of the standards for NBPTS, should the teacher choose to follow the NBPTS route. *Take One!* is initiated after plan approval. Evidence of successful completion of *Take One!* is provided in the CEO portfolio.

### **Recommendation IV: Inclusion of a leadership project**

A leadership project has been added to assist the teacher, school, and/or district in meeting a need that will enhance the culture of the school and/or district by providing a positive direct impact on student achievement. Based on Standard 10, the leadership component will directly align with the job-embedded professional development plan. The leadership project will be similar in scope to the plan of the Teacher Performance Assessment and will be judged against the Advanced Level Performances. The leadership plan is initiated after plan approval. Evidence of successful completion of the leadership project is provided in the CEO portfolio.

### **Recommendation V: Scoring changes for the plan and the portfolio**

New to the CEO process will be the requirement for an external scoring of the CEO plan. Under the current system, the coach reviews the plans and approves them based upon a scoring rubric. However, often during the scoring, many standards on the portfolio are not met due to some portfolios' being submitted with errors in the plans. Under the new system, a double-blind external scoring team will verify that all components of the plan are met prior to a teacher's implementing a plan for future portfolio submission.

## Agenda Book

The Task Force also recommends limiting the window for portfolio submission to once per year, following a candidate's minimum 18 month time frame. The once per year submission will allow for an intense session of scoring among a cadre of certified scorers. Scorers will be chosen from a set of trained individuals who best fit the academic content area of the teacher's CEO portfolio. Preference will be given to those scorers who have completed the CEO or NBPTS process. Currently, coaches may also serve as scorers. To improve the objectivity and reliability of the scoring, the task force recommends a separate team of scorers.

### **Recommendation VI: Change to the fee schedule**

The Continuing Education Option program has historically been a self-supporting system. In order to maintain this level of support and to allow for needed additional external scoring of the plan, the fee schedule for the CEO program will increase. The suggested fee schedule is outlined below:

Approximate total: \$6,500

- Registration fee: \$1,050 (Includes registration into KyEducators.org (\$150) and seminar sponsor (\$900))
- Plan scoring fee: \$555
- Plan re-submission scoring: \$50
- *Take One!* \$395
- CEO final submission scoring: \$1500
- Portfolio re-scoring fee: \$150 per standard
- University courses: Varies per university (approximately \$3000 for two 3-hour graduate courses)

### **Recommendation VII: Completion of the CEO as a one-time- only option for either a Rank II or a Rank I**

In recent years, several teachers who have used the CEO program to obtain Rank II have sought to use the same process for Rank I. No regulation prohibits a teacher from using the CEO to obtain both. Task force members, as well as scorers, have concerns about the validity of the portfolios that may be submitted for Rank I as there is no mechanism in place to ensure that the same portfolio had not been submitted for Rank II.

Attached is the draft regulation incorporating the changes reflecting the recommendations of the CEO Task Force.

### **Contact Person**

Mr. Robert Brown, Director  
Division of Professional Learning and Assessment  
(502) 564 – 4606  
E-mail: robertl.brown@ky.gov

---

**Executive Director**

### **Date:**

January 26, 2009



## Agenda Book

16 KAR 8:030. Continuing education option for certificate renewal and rank change.

RELATES TO: KRS 161.020, 161.028, 161.030, 161.095, 161.1211

STATUTORY AUTHORITY: KRS 161.020, 161.028(1)(a), (f), (q), 161.030(1),  
161.095, 161.1211

NECESSITY, FUNCTION, AND CONFORMITY: KRS 161.095 requires the Education Professional Standards Board to promulgate an administrative regulation establishing procedures for a teacher to maintain a certificate by successfully completing meaningful continuing education. KRS 161.028(1)(f), and 161.030 vest authority for the issuance and renewal of certification for all professional school personnel in the board, and KRS 161.028(1)(q) authorizes the board to charge reasonable certification fees. KRS 161.1211 establishes certificate ranks and requires the board to issue rank classifications. This administrative regulation establishes the procedures for the continuing education option for certificate renewal and rank change.

Section 1. Procedures for the first and second renewal of the professional teaching certificate established in 16 KAR 2:010 shall require completion of:

(1) The continuing education option established in this administrative regulation; or

(2) A planned fifth-year program established in 16 KAR 8:020.

Section 2. The Continuing Education Option shall only be used to obtain either Rank II or Rank I. An educator who completes the CEO for Rank II shall not participate in the Continuing Education Option for Rank I.

Section 3. Program Requirements. (1) The Continuing Education Option shall consist of four (4) phases:

## Agenda Book

(a) Phase One (1): Completion of an instructional seminar as described in Section 4 and development of ~~[(1) Building]~~ a plan for job-embedded professional development ~~[and completion of the on line module, described in Section 3(2)(e) of this administrative regulation];~~

(b) Phase Two (2): ~~[(2)]~~ Content exploration and research;

(c) Phase Three (3): ~~[(3)]~~ Student instruction and assessment; and

(d) Phase Four (4): ~~[(4)]~~ Professional demonstration ~~[leadership]~~ and publication.

(2) A candidate for the Continuing Education Option shall in addition to the completion of the four (4) phases listed in subsection (1) of this subsection, complete the following:

(a) Development of a leadership project aligned to the job embedded professional development identified in Phase 1;

(b) A minimum of six (6) graduate credit hours, with an average grade point average of three point five (3.5) aligned to the job-embedded professional development identified in Phase 1; and

(c) The “Take One!” component for National Board Teacher Certification with a successful score as established by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Section 4. ~~[(3-)]~~ (1) A candidate for ~~[teacher who chooses]~~ the Continuing Education Option for certificate renewal and rank change shall:

(a) Attend a program orientation meeting, approved by the Education Professional Standards Board, ~~[conducted by the Education Professional Standards Board or its designee,]~~ prior to applying for this program; and

(b) Successfully complete a seminar approved by the Education Professional Standards Board on how to build a plan for ~~the~~ job-embedded professional development.

~~(2)(a) [The seminar shall be approved by the Education Professional Standards Board for this purpose.~~

~~—(b)]~~ A school district, group of districts, or any Kentucky postsecondary institution with an accredited educator preparation program may make application to the Education Professional Standards Board for approval to sponsor a seminar on how to build a plan for job-embedded professional development. The Education Professional Standards Board may sponsor a seminar on how to build a plan for job-embedded professional development in any district or group of districts in which a seminar is not otherwise offered.

(b) ~~(c)]~~ The seminar on how to build a plan for job-embedded professional development shall be led by a Continuing Education Option coach approved by the Education Professional Standards Board.

(c) ~~(d)]~~ The seminar on how to build a plan for job-embedded professional development may ~~shall~~ be a blend of:

1. Web-based instruction; and
2. Face-to-face cohort meetings.

(d) The Education Professional Standards Board may provide web-based instruction through an on-line module at [www.KYEducators.org](http://www.KYEducators.org).

(e) A seminar sponsor shall offer face-to-face cohort meetings at least two (2) times per month during the plan building seminar. ~~[The web-based instruction shall be~~

## Agenda Book

provided by the Education Professional Standards Board through an on-line module at [www.KyEducators.org](http://www.KyEducators.org).

(f)1. The face to face cohort meetings shall be offered at least two (2) times per month during the plan building seminar.]

(3) [2.] Following completion of phase one (1) of the continuing education option, a seminar sponsor shall continue face-to face cohort meetings on a monthly basis. [face-to face cohort meetings shall continue on a monthly basis.]

(4) [(g)] Completion of the first phase of the continuing education option allows the candidate to receive first renewal of the candidate's certificate beginning July 30, 2010. [June 30, 2002.]

(5) [(3)] Payment of seminar tuition.

(a)1. Tuition for the on-line module provided by the Education Professional Standards Board shall be \$150; and

2. The on-line module fee shall be paid to the Education Professional Standards Board at the time of enrollment as indicated in the on-line enrollment application.

(b)1. Tuition for the cohort meetings shall be \$900; [\$600;] and

2. The cohort meeting fee shall be paid to the approved seminar sponsor.

(c)1. Seminar tuition shall be nonrefundable.

2. A cohort meeting fee may be transferred to another seminar sponsor upon agreement between both sponsors.

(4)(a) Upon completion of the seminar, the Continuing Education Option candidate shall design an individual job-embedded professional development plan.

(b) The job-embedded professional development plan shall:

1. [shall be designed by the teacher and shall:

## Agenda Book

(a)] Focus on a professional growth need identified by the teacher with consideration given to the needs identified in the school's consolidated plan, student assessment results, and community resources;

2. [(b)] Include goals correlated to:

a. Each of the ten (10) experienced teacher standards established in 16 KAR 1:010;

b. The Advanced Level Performance Indicators incorporated by reference in this administrative regulation; and

c. ~~[and Directly related to]~~ The teacher's individual professional growth needs established in clause (1) of this paragraph ~~[paragraph (a) of this subsection];~~

3. [(c)] Include a timeline in which the candidate shall complete all phases of the continuing education option. The timeline shall not:

a. ~~[1.]~~ Be less than eighteen (18) ~~[twelve (12)]~~ months; ~~or [and]~~

b. ~~[2.]~~ Be more than four (4) years; and

4. ~~[(d)]~~ Be reviewed by the continuing education option coach for the seminar cohort.

(c) ~~[1.]~~ The continuing education option coach shall:

1. ~~[a.]~~ Review the plans using the Initial Scoring Rubric incorporated by reference in the Administrative Regulation; and

2. Provide guidance to the candidate for submitting the plan to the Education Professional Standards Board for scoring.

(d) 1. The candidate shall submit the plan to the Education Professional Standards Board for review and approval by a scoring team. ~~[scoring rubric approved by the Education Professional Standards Board;~~

## Agenda Book

~~b. Provide written feedback on each standard to the teacher regarding the quality of the plan; and~~

~~c. Notify the Education Professional Standards Board of all reviewed plans.]~~

2. The candidate ~~[teacher]~~ may resubmit the plan for an additional scoring [review] if the continuing education scoring team [option coach] has provided evidence of a deficiency or deficiencies in the plan.

3. The candidate shall submit a scoring fee of \$555 to the Education Professional Standards Board with the plan.

4. If a candidate submits a plan for additional scoring, the candidate shall submit a re-scoring fee of \$50 to the Education Professional Standards Board with the plan.

(5)(a) The candidate [teacher] shall participate in a job-embedded professional development experience with documented outcomes that demonstrate the accomplishment of the established goals.

(b) A job-embedded professional development experience shall include a combination of:

1. A minimum of six (6) university graduate credits; [Graduate college coursework;]

2. Research;

3. Field-experience;

4. Professional development activities; [or]

5. Interdisciplinary networking and consultations;

6. The “Take One!” component aligned with the candidate’s area of certification as established by the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards; and

7. A leadership project.

~~[(e) The experience shall be identified in the professional development plan.~~

1 ~~—(d) The experience may be:~~

2 ~~—1. A part of an approved school professional development plan; or~~

3 ~~—2. An experience specifically needed by the teacher.]~~

4 (6)(a) The evidence of accomplishment of the goals identified in the plan shall be  
5 documented by the candidate in a portfolio.

6 (b) The candidate shall present the portfolio [~~shall be presented~~] to the Education  
7 Professional Standards Board for review and scoring.

8 (c) The documentation in the portfolio shall provide evidence:

9 1. That all Kentucky [~~experienced~~] Teacher Standards and Advanced Level  
10 Performance Indicators have been met;

11 2. Of the effects on student learning; and

12 3. Of the professional growth over time in:

13 a. Content knowledge;

14 b. Instructional and student assessment practices; and

15 c. Professional demonstration [~~leadership~~] and publication skills.

16 (d) The portfolio shall be presented using a variety of mediums, which may include  
17 video recordings.

18 (e) The portfolio shall be submitted to the Education Professional Standards Board at  
19 least one (1) year in advance of the expiration date of the teacher's certificate.

20 (f) The portfolio shall be submitted in either:

21 1. A traditional paper format with videotape or digital video disc (DVD) hard copy;

22 or

23 2. An electronic format.

(g) A portfolio shall not exceed three (3) four (4) inch binders in size or its electronic equivalent.

Section 4. (1)(a) Initial application for the continuing education option program shall be made through a seminar sponsor approved by the Education Professional Standards Board.

(b) The approved seminar sponsor shall report all enrolled applicants to the Education Professional Standards Board.

~~[(2) An enrolled applicant shall register on line at [www.KyEducators.org](http://www.KyEducators.org) for the on-line continuing education option plan building module established in Section 3(2) of this administrative regulation.]~~

Section 5. (1) A team of two (2) scorers ~~[readers]~~ approved by the Education Professional Standards Board shall review and score the continuing education portfolio.

(2) The scorers ~~[readers]~~ shall be selected by the Education Professional Standards Board from a cadre of educators representing teachers, principals, central office instructional personnel, and higher education faculty ~~[, professional organization representatives, and the Kentucky Department of Education staff.]~~

(3) The two (2) person scoring ~~[reading]~~ team shall:

(a) Include a teacher certified in the same grade range and content area as the continuing education option candidate;

(b) Score the candidate's portfolio using the Portfolio Scoring Rubric incorporated by reference in the administrative regulation; ~~[Use a scoring rubric that is based on the experienced teacher standards and indicators to review and score the portfolios;]~~

(c)1. Recommend the teacher for certificate renewal to the Education Professional Standards Board prior to the expiration date of the certificate; or

2. Report results to the Education Professional Standards Board using the scoring rubric to indicate which standards were not met; and

(d) Be trained by the Education Professional Standards Board to score the portfolios in a consistent and reliable manner.

(4) If the two (2) person scoring ~~[reading]~~ team cannot reach consensus in the review process, a third scorer ~~[chief reader employed by the Education Professional Standards Board]~~ shall score the portfolio. An average of the scores shall determine whether portfolio contained evidence that the ten (10) Kentucky teaching standards were met. [and report results to the Education Professional Standards Board.]

(5)(a) If the teacher's portfolio does not contain ~~[show]~~ evidence that all ten (10) Kentucky ~~[experienced]~~ Teacher Standards have been met, the teacher may resubmit a partial portfolio for rescoring, which shall contain documented evidence on the unmet standard or standards.

(b) The rescoring process shall follow the same procedures as the initial scoring process established in this section of this administrative regulation.

(c) The teacher shall receive feedback from the initial scoring regarding additional evidence that may be needed to show that goals were accomplished and that all Kentucky ~~[experienced]~~ teacher standards were met.

Section 6. (1) A teacher following the continuing education option to the fifth-year program for certificate renewal and rank change shall complete the program by the end of the second certificate renewal period.

## Agenda Book

1       ~~[(2) For the first renewal, the teacher shall show evidence of completion of phase one~~  
2       ~~(1) of the continuing education option.]~~

3

4       Section 7. Payment of Fee for Scoring the Portfolio. (1) A scoring fee of \$1500  
5       ~~[\$1200]~~ shall be assessed to each continuing education option candidate.

6       (2) The fee shall be used to pay expenses for the actual cost of administration of the  
7       continuing education option program including the costs associated with the following:

8       (a) The evaluation of approved seminar provider programs;

9       (b) Training the continuing education option coaches who lead the seminars;

10      (c) Training and compensating the portfolio reading team members; and

11      (d) The initial scoring of the portfolio.

12      (3) Payment shall be made to the Education Professional Standards Board.

13      (4) The full fee shall be due at the time that the portfolio, or parts thereof as stipulated  
14      in Section 6(2) of this administrative regulation, are submitted to the Education  
15      Professional Standards Board for scoring.

16      (5) The initial scoring fee shall provide for one (1) scoring of all parts of the portfolio.

17      (6)(a) A fee of \$150 ~~[\$120]~~ shall be assessed for each unmet standard that requires  
18      rescoring.

19      (b) The rescoring fee, if applicable, shall be paid to the Education Professional  
20      Standards Board at the time that the revised portfolio is submitted for rescoring.

21

22      Section 8. (1) A candidate who submitted a professional development plan prior to  
23      July 30, 2010 shall submit a portfolio for scoring to the Education Professional Standards  
24      Board on the following schedule:

1 (a) Candidates enrolled in the Continuing Education Option in calendar year 2005  
2 shall submit the portfolio by January 15, 2010;

3 (b) Candidates enrolled in the Continuing Education Option in calendar year 2006  
4 shall submit the portfolio by January 15, 2011; and

5 (c) Candidates enrolled in the Continuing Education Option in calendar year 2007  
6 shall submit the portfolio by January 15, 2012.

7 ~~\_\_\_\_\_ (2) A teacher who submitted a professional development plan prior to June 30,~~  
8 ~~2002 shall have until December 31, 2004 to complete the continuing education option~~  
9 ~~program.~~

10 ~~— (2) If the teacher fails to complete the program by December 31, 2004, the teacher~~  
11 ~~shall forfeit all fees and reapply to participate under the revised guidelines.~~

12 ~~— (3)(a) A continuing education option candidate who enrolled prior to June 30, 2002~~  
13 ~~shall be notified by the Education Professional Standards Board that his portfolio shall be~~  
14 ~~completed by December 31, 2004.~~

15 ~~— (b) The notification shall be by registered mail.~~

16 ~~— (c) The candidate's portfolio shall be scored using the rubric in effect when the~~  
17 ~~candidate enrolled in the continuing education option program.~~

18 (3) [(d)] A candidate under this section shall not be charged an additional fee for  
19 rescoring a previously submitted portfolio.

20 (4) [(e)] The candidate under this section shall be provided an opportunity to  
21 participate in a cohort established in Section 3 of this administrative regulation.

22 (5) [(f)] The candidate under this section shall be offered coaching by an approved  
23 continuing education option coach.

24

Section 9. (1) Portfolios shall be scored by the Education Professional Standards Board on annual basis. [~~a quarterly basis.~~]

(2) A candidate [teacher] shall have been enrolled in the continuing education option program for at least eighteen (18) [~~twelve (12)~~] months prior to submission of the portfolio to the Education Professional Standards Board for scoring.

(3) A candidate [~~teacher~~] shall submit a portfolio to the Education Professional Standards Board for initial scoring between July 1 and July 15.[~~:~~

~~—(a) Between January 1 and January 15;~~

~~—(b) Between April 1 and April 15;~~

~~—(c) Between July 1 and July 15; or~~

~~—(d) Between October 1 and October 15.]~~

(4) The date of portfolio submission shall be either:

(a) The day the portfolio is hand-delivered to the Education Professional Standards Board offices; or

(b) The date of the postmark.

(5) A portfolio that requires rescoring shall be resubmitted during one (1) of the rescoring windows of October 1 - 5 or January 1 -15. Portfolios not submitted within the rescoring window shall be resubmitted in accordance with the schedule established in subsection (3) of this section. [~~A portfolio that requires rescoring shall be resubmitted in accordance with the schedule established in subsection (3) of this section.~~]

(6) All portfolios shall become the property of the Education Professional Standards Board.

(7)(a) The Education Professional Standards Board shall provide electronic tracking of all portfolios to identify cases of plagiarism.

## Agenda Book

- 1 (b) Instances of plagiarism shall be reported to the Education Professional Standards  
2 Board for disciplinary action.

3 Section 10. Incorporation by Reference. (1) The following material is  
4 incorporated by reference:

5 (a) The Kentucky Teaching Standards Advanced Level Performance Indicator;

6 (b) Initial Plan Scoring Rubric; and

7 (c)Portfolio Scoring Rubric.



**EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD  
STAFF NOTE**

**Information/Discussion Item B**

**Information Item:**

To inform the EPSB about contracts and amendments which were signed by the executive director since the prior EPSB board meeting.

**Applicable Statutes and Regulation:**

KRS 161.028 (1) (v) (d)

KRS 161.017 (3)

**Applicable Goal:**

Goal 6: The EPSB shall be managed for both effectiveness and efficiency, fully complying with all statutes, regulations, and established federal, state, and agency policies.

**Background:**

KRS 161.028 (1) (v) authorizes the EPSB to enter into contracts and KRS 161.017 (3) stipulates that with board approval the executive director may enter into agreements "...to enlist assistance to implement the duties and responsibilities of the board." The EPSB approved procedures for seeking approval and authorization for entering contractual agreements at the October 23, 2006 EPSB meeting.

- As a result of the recent request for proposal, the EPSB has issued multiple contracts with local school districts and educational cooperatives for services to provide mentoring for National Board Professional Teacher candidates. These contracts will provide a variety of services including workshops for teachers, mentor training, program coordinators and collection of documentation. The funds were distributed based on an estimated number of candidates to be served as follows:

<b>Vendor Name Contract Amt.</b>	<b>Services</b>	<b>Service Period</b>	
CKEC	Mentoring and training	Jan. 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010	\$22,225
GRREC	Mentoring and training	Jan. 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010	\$63,500
KEDC	Mentoring and training	Jan. 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010	\$34,925
NKEC	Mentoring and training	Jan. 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010	\$22,225
OVEC	Mentoring and training	Jan. 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010	\$22,225
WKEC	Mentoring and training	Jan. 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010	\$38,100

## Agenda Book

Fayette County PS	Mentoring and training	Jan. 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010	\$31,750
Franklin County PS	Mentoring and training	Jan. 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010	\$15,875
Jefferson Co. PS	Mentoring and training	Jan. 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010	\$47,625
Logan County PS	Mentoring and training	Jan. 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010	\$12,700
Marion County PS	Mentoring and training	Jan. 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010	\$6,350
McCracken Co. PS	Mentoring and training	Jan. 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010	\$5,080
Muhlenberg Co. PS	Mentoring and training	Jan. 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010	\$6,350
Oldham Co. PS	Mentoring and training	Jan. 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010	\$22,225
Simpson Co. PS	Mentoring and training	Jan. 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010	\$10,160

### **Groups/Persons Consulted:**

N/A

### **Contact Person:**

Mr. Gary W. Freeland  
Deputy Executive Director  
(502) 564-4606  
E-mail: garyw.freeland@ky.gov

---

**Executive Director**

### **Date:**

January 26, 2009

Agenda Book  
**EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD  
STAFF NOTE**

**Information/Discussion Item C**

**Information Item:**

A report on the year-to-date financial performance of the agency's programs and operations through December 31, 2008

**Applicable Statutes and Regulation:**

KRS 161.017 (1) (c)

**Applicable Goal:**

Goal 6: The EPSB shall be managed for both effectiveness and efficiency, fully complying with all statutes, regulations, and established federal, state, and agency policies.

**Background:**

The board receives two budget updates each year. This is the mid-year report. The final report will be provided in August 2009.

**Groups/Persons Consulted:**

None – All information was produced from information maintained in the eMARS financial system and analysis by Gary Freeland.

**Contact Person:**

Mr. Gary W. Freeland  
Deputy Executive Director  
(502) 564-4606  
E-mail: garyw.freeland@ky.gov

---

**Executive Director**

**Date:**

January 26, 2009



Agenda Book  
**EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD  
STAFF NOTE**

**Information/Discussion Item D**

**Information Item:**

Implementation Plan for the Mathematics Task Force Recommendations

**Applicable Statutes and Regulations:**

KRS 161.028, 161.030  
16 KAR 5:010

**Applicable Goal:**

Goal 1: Every approved educator preparation program meets or exceeds all accreditation standards and prepares knowledgeable, capable teachers and administrators who demonstrate effectiveness in helping all students reach educational achievement.

**Background:**

In November 2008, the Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) gave final approval to the recommendations presented by the Mathematics Task Force at the September 2008 board meeting. During discussion of the recommendations, the board requested staff to develop an implementation plan with a timeline that would guide educator preparation programs in making the necessary changes.

**Group Consulted:**

**Mathematics Task Force:**

Ms. Melanie Curlin, Teacher  
Ms. Anita Barnes, Teacher  
Ms. Ann Bartosh, Kentucky Department of Education  
Mr. Bryan Edwards, Teacher  
Ms. Janet Castle, Retired Teacher  
Ms. Christy Drury, Teacher  
Mr. John DeAtley, Council on Postsecondary Education  
Ms. Linda Klembara, Retired Teacher  
Ms. Barbara Ledford: Math/Science, Harlan Independent Schools  
Dr. Rich Millman, University of Kentucky Faculty  
Dr. Steve Newman, Northern Kentucky University Faculty  
Dr. Janet Parker, Georgetown College  
Ms. Leslie Robertson, Teacher  
Dr. Manish Sharma, Thomas More College Faculty  
Ms. Brenda Scruggs, Teacher  
Dr. John Yopp, Director Appalachian Math and Sciences Project

**Contact Person:**

Dr. Marilyn K. Troupe, Director  
Division of Educator Preparation  
(502) 564-4606  
E-mail: marilyn.troupe@ky.gov

---

**Executive Director**

**Date:**

January 26, 2009

Agenda Book  
**MATHEMATICS RECOMMENDATIONS  
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN  
January 26, 2009**

**SECTION I: Requires regulatory change**

Recommendation I/Implementation I:

Mathematics Endorsement for Elementary Teachers (Primary -5 Grades)

Regulation 16 KAR 2:010, Kentucky Teaching Certificates establishes the certifications that are issued to teachers by the Division of Certification. The Certification Task Force (CTF) will add the mathematics endorsement to the recommendations that should be ready for board review in March 2009.

The Division of Educator Preparation (DEP) established endorsement guidelines more than five (5) years ago and recently revised those guidelines for the ***Mathematics Endorsement for Elementary Teachers***. The guidelines include the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics' (NCTM) Preparation of Elementary Mathematics Specialist Teachers, Core Content for Mathematics in Elementary, and the Kentucky Teacher Standards at the Initial and/or Advanced levels are the standards that shall be used to develop the endorsement. The endorsement will address recommendations of the Mathematics Task Force.

**SECTION II: Requires written report with a two-month timeline**

Recommendations II & III Combined/Implementation II: Due Date: March 31, 2009

All educator preparation institutions with an approved elementary program should provide the following information to the DEP in the form of a written report addressing each of the bullet points. Colleges/universities should identify where in their mathematics courses/programs the following components are emphasized:

A. Mathematical Knowledge for Teaching

Educator preparation institutions demonstrate current approaches to the teaching of mathematics:

- Emphasize deepening teachers' knowledge of the mathematics they teach as well as increasing their understanding of why math procedures work
- Emphasize promoting mathematical reasoning, sense making, problem solving, computational fluency, and justification, each facilitating the learning of the others
- Ensure that the Kentucky Program of Studies and the Core Content for Assessment (Core Content for Mathematics in Elementary School) are covered by courses and are viewed collaboratively with districts, teachers, and arts and sciences faculty

B. Pedagogical Content Knowledge

Educator preparation institutions shall ensure that candidates learn the following:

- How children learn mathematics so teachers can use different texts and design instruction to meet individual learning needs
- How to determine what students know and understand, using formative assessments to guide instruction

- How to provide strategies and resources for teaching mathematics, including those for differentiated instruction

C. Verticality (V) of the Mathematics in PreK-12 Curriculum

Educator preparation institutions shall demonstrate the integration of mathematics at all grade levels:

- Teachers should have a sense of how concepts are introduced in the elementary curriculum and then woven through the middle school curriculum.
- Teachers need to see the vertical nature of mathematics, to understand that teaching fractions in elementary lays the foundation for algebra in middle school.

**SECTION III: Required changes will occur as new programs are submitted for approval and current programs are resubmitted for accreditation preparations**

Recommendation IV/Implementation III:

As curriculum changes occur in mathematics, educator preparation programs and school districts should collaborate in co-designing courses.

- Include in the master's redesign, where applicable
- Include in new submissions and resubmissions of the elementary mathematics programs

Recommendation V/Implementation IV:

This recommendation will adapt well to the current emphasis on collaboration, learning communities, and co-design as key to involving the district and teachers in the planning of preparation courses.

- Provide opportunities for PreK-12 teachers to collaborate and discuss the challenges and issues of teaching math across grade levels.
- Communicate the outcome of such discussions to administrators.

Elementary teachers are not aware of the expectations at the middle school level, and middle school mathematics is not aligned with high school preparation. How can teachers help students transition from elementary to middle to high school from within a math maze? Teachers need to discuss instructional practices in order to find the balance between conceptual development and computational fluency. All of this is related to the vertical integration of the PreK-12 mathematic courses.

Districts and PreK-12 educators need assistance from educator preparation institutions to provide yearly sessions for mathematic teachers from the different grade levels to discuss common issues related to expectations, core content, and instructional strategies. Much of what teachers need to discuss is not in textbooks. The dialogue could include a review of the grade level objectives and how they fit into the overall mathematic requirements.

Agenda Book

**EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD**

**MATHEMATICS TASK FORCE**

**Approved November 17, 2008**

**Recommendation I:**

Develop an Endorsement Certificate for Mathematics

Rationale:

The education of elementary math teachers should continue beyond initial certification. The mathematics endorsement should provide teachers with mathematical content and pedagogical knowledge and skills to enhance their preparation as classroom teachers to enrich the curriculum in the schools. These teachers may be teacher leaders to whom other teachers can turn for support in the teaching of math.

**Recommendation II:**

Educator preparation programs should adopt a three-pronged approach to preparing elementary teachers to teach math.

**A. Mathematical Knowledge for Teaching (MKT)**

Educator preparation programs should reorganize mathematics courses to accomplish the following:

- Embrace current approaches for math educator programs because pre-service preparation is crucial
- Emphasize deepening teachers' knowledge of the mathematics they teach as well as increasing their understanding of why math procedures work
- Emphasize promoting mathematical reasoning, sense making, problem solving, computational fluency, and justification, each facilitating the learning of the others
- Ensure that the Kentucky Program of Studies and the Core Content for Assessment are covered by courses and are viewed collaboratively with districts, teachers, and arts and sciences faculty

**B. Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK)**

Educator preparation's mathematics programs should ensure that candidates learn the following:

- How children learn mathematics so teachers can use different texts and design instruction to meet individual learning needs
- How to determine what students know and understand, using formative assessments to guide instruction
- How to provide strategies and resources for teaching mathematics, including those for differentiated instruction

**C. Verticality (V) of the Mathematics in P-12 Curriculum**

"Teacher education programs and licensure tests for early childhood teachers, including all special education teachers at this level, should fully address the topics on whole numbers, fractions, and the appropriate geometry and measurement topics in

## Agenda Book

the Critical Foundations of Algebra, as well as the concepts and skills leading to them; for elementary teachers, including elementary level special education teachers, all topics in the Critical Foundations of Algebra and those topics typically covered in an introductory Algebra course; and for middle school teachers, including middle school special education teachers, the Critical Foundations of Algebra and all of the Major Topics of School Algebra.” *The National Mathematics Advisory Panel Final Report - 2008*

- Teachers should have a sense of how concepts are introduced in the elementary curriculum and then woven through the middle school curriculum.
- Teachers need to see the vertical nature of mathematics, to understand that teaching fractions in elementary lays the foundation for algebra in middle school.
- Colleges/universities should determine the desired math learning outcomes and design courses to meet those outcomes.
- IHE’s should ensure that their preservice teachers are well-versed in the Kentucky Program of Studies and the Core Content for Assessment.

### **Recommendation III:**

- Colleges/universities should identify where in their mathematics courses/program the three components (MKT, PCK and V) are emphasized.

### **Recommendation IV:**

- As curriculum changes, educator preparation programs and school districts should collaborate in co-designing mathematics courses.

### **Recommendation V:**

- Provide opportunities for PreK-12 teachers to collaborate and discuss the challenges and issues of teaching math across grade levels.
- Communicate the outcome of such discussions to administrators.

Rationale for recommendations II through V:

“The national advisory panel has recommended that the PreK-8 content curriculum should be streamlined to emphasize the topics in what the panel calls the Critical Foundations of Algebra. These topics are very closely aligned to the topics recommended by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) in its 2006 publication, *Curriculum Focal Points for Prekindergarten through Grade 8 Mathematics: A Quest for Coherence*.” *The National Mathematics Advisory Panel Final Report - 2008*

The MTF supports the National Advisory Panel’s recommendation that the PreK-8 mathematics curriculum be streamlined through collaborative efforts of the Kentucky Department of Education and the Education Professional Standards Board.

Agenda Book  
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cavanagh, Sean, *Essential Qualities of Math Teaching Remain Unknown*, Education Week, March 28, 2008

Friedberg, Solomon, *Teachers must be up for count*, Boston Herald, April 23, 2007

Hechinger, John, *Effort to Fix 'Broken' System Sets Targets for Each Grade*, Avoids Taking Sides on Method, March 5, 2008

Kessel, Cathy and Ma, Liping; *What we think that elementary teachers need*, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 2008

Manzo, Kathleen Kennedy, *U.S. Middle-Grades Teachers Found III-Prepared in Math*, Education Week, December 19, 2007, Vol. 27.No. 16

Millman, Richard and Ma, Xin; *The Design of a Mathematics Content Course to Integrate the Assessment Principle: Recent Results*, October 17, 2005

Newman, Steve, *The Algebra Problem*, White Paper, Department of Mathematics, Northern Kentucky University

Reys, Barbara, *Who should lead mathematics instruction at the elementary school level: a case for mathematics specialists*, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Inc., 2003

Schencker, Lisa, Math report recommends teachers focus more in depth on fewer skills, Salt Lake Tribune, April 11, 2008

Zuckerbrod, Nancy, *Poor math scores are examined: More focus urged on basics, fractions*, Herald-Leader, March 14, 2008

Dr. Deborah L. Ball, Dean of the School of Education and William H. Payne Collegiate Professor at the University of Michigan. Dr. Ball, a former elementary school teacher, was a member of the National Mathematics Advisory Panel appointed by the President.

Dr. Lee Shulman was President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. His focus has been on strengthening the role of teaching in higher education. Through the Carnegie Foundation he has “emphasized the importance of ‘teaching as community property’ and the central role of the scholarship of teaching in supporting the needed changes in the cultures of higher education.” Teaching and teacher education have been the focus of his writing.

Committee on Mathematics Achievement, Strategic Plan for Improving Mathematics Achievement in Kentucky, January 2007

*Curriculum Focal Points for Prekindergarten through Grade 8 Mathematics*, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 2006

*The National Mathematics Advisory Panel Final Report: Foundations for Success*, The National Mathematics Advisory Panel, U.S. Department of Education, 2008



Agenda Book  
**EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD  
STAFF NOTE**

**Information/Discussion Item E**

**Information Item:**

Certification Task Force Recommendations

**Applicable Statutes and Regulation:**

KRS 161.028, 161.048  
16 KAR 2:010

**Applicable Goal:**

Goal 2: Every professional position in a Kentucky public school is staffed by a properly credentialed educator.

**Issue:**

Should the Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) approve the Certification Task Force recommendations?

**Background:**

During its June 2008 retreat, the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) was presented with a number of current climatic conditions in the area of Kentucky teacher certification and its immediate and future workforce needs. The presentation resulted in discussion concerning if and how EPSB regulations may need to be modified to better meet these needs. The examination was precipitated by a variety of factors seen in today's teaching marketplace. Among these factors are regional teacher shortages in some certification areas, legislative interest in broadening program offerings to develop teachers in mathematics and science, increasing teacher mobility into Kentucky, and current regulations which affect reciprocity in out-of-state certification.

In addition, the EPSB will be re-signing the Interstate Agreement of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) in 2010. This agreement, which Kentucky last signed in 2004 to accept teacher certification (under certain conditions) from 19 other states, is a key component in establishing the state's willingness to accept out-of-state teacher certificates via reciprocity. Although true reciprocity, i.e., unconditional acceptance of a certification, currently exists in only two states, the Board may want to consider expanding the number of conditions it will accept when considering out-of-state educator certifications. In preparation for the signing of the NASDTEC agreement, the Board believed that input from stakeholders will be an important piece of information to guide its decisions regarding out-of-state certifications and their acceptance in Kentucky.

The Certification Task Force (CTF) was formed to examine the EPSB's teacher certification regulations and how they work to meet the needs of Kentucky public school districts. The group comprised district human resources professionals and university

## Agenda Book

representatives, as well as representatives from the Kentucky Department of Education. Other stakeholders with intimate knowledge and interest in conditions relative to teacher certification were also included.

The task force was asked by the Board to make recommendations in the following areas:

1. An examination of alternative certification programs within the state;
2. Expansion of grade level permissions of middle school mathematics certificates to allow teaching of additional courses at the high school level;
3. Methods to allow current experienced Kentucky teachers to add certification areas without the completion of an additional teacher preparation program, including modifications to the TC-HQ certification process;
4. Emerging areas in certification, particularly with occupation-based certificates;
5. Use of the proficiency evaluation by universities to aid teachers in adding certification areas;
6. Critical attributes to consider when accepting or rejecting out-of-state certifications and endorsements.

The task force began meeting in September 2008 and held day-long meetings throughout the fall. In September 2008 the group sent an electronic survey to a wide group of stakeholders (superintendents, principals, HR managers, higher education deans, chairs, and teacher education committee members) to conduct a needs assessment based on the observations of those in the field. Using the results of this survey and the objectives set forth by the EPSB, the task force has constructed recommendations that it believes will accomplish the following:

- meet the EPSB goal related to properly credentialed educators
- be realistic and helpful to districts and the students they serve
- not be detrimental to teacher quality in Kentucky. (Task force recommendations are attached)

### **Groups Consulted:**

#### **Certification Task Force:**

Kim Alexander	Eastern Kentucky University
Michael Dailey	KY Department of Education
Bill Eckels	Jefferson County Public Schools
Frank Cheatham	Campbellsville University
Kenneth Galloway	Graves County Public Schools
Cindy Godsey	KY Education Professional Standards Board
Jon Hall	Simpson County Public Schools
Kevin Hub	Madison County Public Schools
Henry Lacy	KY Department of Education
John Marks	Office for Career and Technical Education
Kricket McClure	Henry County Public Schools
Roger Johnson	Pike County Public Schools
Melodee Parker	Fayette County Public Schools
Paul Wirtz	Northern Kentucky University

## Agenda Book

Mickey Rice	Boyd County Public Schools
Brad Stanley	Owensboro Public Schools
Mike Tolliver	Kenton County Public Schools
Russ Wall	Murray State University

### **Other Groups Providing Input:**

Kentucky Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Kentucky Association of School Human Resource Managers

Center for Middle School Academic Achievement

Bluegrass Council of Teacher Educators (Fayette County Public Schools)

Mathematics faculty members at Northern Kentucky University, Eastern Kentucky University, Western Kentucky University and Murray State University

Mathematics program personnel with the Kentucky Department of Education

Electronic survey sent to state superintendents, human resources directors, principals, higher education deans/chairs and Teacher Education Committee members

### **Contact Person:**

Mr. Michael C. Carr, Director  
Division of Certification  
(502) 564-4606  
E-mail: mike.carr@ky.gov

---

**Executive Director**

### **Date:**

January 26, 2009



**EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD**

**CERTIFICATION TASK FORCE (CTF)  
RECOMMENDATIONS**

*(Identified by focus areas provided by the EPSB in the CTF Charter)*

**ALTERNATIVE CERTIFICATION**

**Recommendation I:**

Work with the Kentucky Department of Education to ensure that providers of training for SBDM Councils receive a needed component regarding qualifications of candidates as well as their eligibility for hire under KRS 160.345 (2) (h)

**Recommendation II:**

Recognize the critical need to provide more mentoring and coaching early in the first year of the Temporary Provisional certificate holder and solicit financial and in-kind help from the legislature, higher education institutions, and education cooperatives in providing this, particularly for late hires. Require those institutions currently providing alternative certification programs to submit annually to the EPSB their procedures for developing the mentoring plan as required by 16 KAR 9:080, Section 2 (3) (d)

**Rationale for Recommendations I and II:**

The survey conducted by the task force found that a vast majority of stakeholders believe that Kentucky currently has enough alternative certification routes; however, there is a problem with a lack of support for new teachers entering the profession on the Temporary Provisional certificate (Options 6 and 7). The CTF also believes that auditing of the current mentoring plans will heighten awareness among the institutions of the need for vigilance in this area.

**EXPANDING PERMISSIONS OF CURRENT CERTIFICATES**

**Recommendation III:**

Allow Mathematics 5-9 teachers to teach Algebra I at grades 10-11.

**Rationale:**

Districts, particularly smaller ones with a single high school, have asked for some dispensation in allowing Mathematics 5-9 teachers to have the flexibility to teach traditionally high school level classes above the grade range of this certificate. Currently, these teachers may teach Algebra I to 9<sup>th</sup> graders, but allowing them to teach the same content to older students can provide a needed option if additional qualified staff cannot be hired and/or found to do this. The CTF was asked to consider this for Algebra II and geometry as well, but, after much consultation with mathematics practitioners, believes that Algebra I is the only course appropriate to recommend for such a change in teaching permissions.

### **III. MODIFYING REQUIREMENTS FOR CURRENT TEACHERS TO ADD A NEW AREA**

#### **Recommendation IV:**

Modify the current TC-HQ route for adding a new certification area to allow a 45-point component for passage of the required Praxis II assessment(s) within the current 90 point formula. The TC-HQ route will continue to be used only for core subject areas required in the Highly Qualified Teacher component of the federal No Child Left Behind Act. It will not allow a teacher to move from elementary to secondary or from special to regular education.

#### Rationale:

This change would provide more flexibility to the current method to add or extend a current certificate area for those teachers who are fully certified in Kentucky, while still ensuring that the teacher meets all requirements as a Highly Qualified Teacher. The CTF believes that by including the Praxis II within the TC-HQ formula, teacher quality will be maintained while districts will have a new option in dealing with regional shortages in some subject areas (particularly science and mathematics) and diminishing resources to locate and or pay for teachers who are needed for only a partial schedule.

### **NEW/EMERGING AREAS FOR CERTIFICATION**

#### **Recommendation V:**

Add new endorsement certificates for Elementary Mathematics Specialist and Literacy Specialist, K-12.

#### Rationale:

The EPSB's Mathematics Task Force recently recommended the addition of the first endorsement to allow elementary math teachers to continue with specialized preparation beyond the initial elementary certificate. The second endorsement is one of the recommendations in Kentucky's Adolescent Literacy Work Plan as written by the Kentucky Board of Education's Adolescent Literacy Task Force. The addition of each of these new endorsements would allow IHEs to develop new programs in these areas, most likely on the post-baccalaureate level.

#### **Recommendation VI:**

Add a probationary certificate program for English as a Second Language.

#### Rationale:

This area was identified as an area of growing need for districts with too few options to find available teachers. Such a probationary certificate program would follow the gifted endorsement model which allows a professionally certified Kentucky teacher a two-year period to complete the endorsement program. The CTF believes that there would be a market for IHEs within the state to provide courses for this probationary program, particularly near the larger urban districts.

**Recommendation VII:**

Work with the Kentucky Department of Education and the Cabinet for Workforce Investment to convene a work group to discuss the unique needs of the occupation-based areas, including the need to address future certificate needs in the Science, Technology, Engineering & Math (STEM) areas.

Rationale:

Both agencies have begun discussions on a variety of topics related to teacher preparation and certification, and there is a need for a more formalized process which would include EPSB staff. Among the areas of identified need via the CTF are the following:

- creating clear instructional documents for district personnel regarding this unique certification procedure
- reviewing occupation-based rank change requirements
- addressing the rapidly changing nature of health area certifications and
- revamping the certificate/endorsement areas of Information Technology, Instructional Computer Technology, and Computer Information Systems where IHE programs do not match what is taught in the districts.

This group can also formulate recommendations to address the growing national movement that math and science teachers should be prepared and/or retrained toward a more integrated (STEM) approach.

**PROFICIENCY EVALUATION**

**Recommendation VIII:**

Update 16 KAR 5:030 regarding proficiency evaluations conducted by IHEs to clarify the EPSB's position regarding the parameters for this process in appropriate situations.

Rationale:

There are limited applications for using this process; however, IHEs have different procedures governing the use of proficiency evaluations. In some cases, this is the only process by which an unusual circumstance may be reviewed by the Division of Certification for a certificate; however, if an IHE policy does not allow the review, the division has no partner to consult in working with the candidate.

**RECIPROCITY WITH OTHER STATES' CERTIFICATE HOLDERS**

**Recommendation IX:**

Advocate for a statutory change to KRS 161.030 (c) which governs the temporary certificate for out-of-state applicants to: 1.) Extend the testing period from six months to one year and 2.) modify the wording to permit the use of this certificate if no *qualified* applicants are available (as opposed to the current wording of no *certified* applicant.)

Rationale:

- 1.) Moving the testing period to one year would align the allowable time period in this statute with a similar statute governing these types of certificates for out-of-state principal candidates (KRS 161.027 (6) (a).) Due to the schedule for the Praxis II assessments, the need in many cases for two assessments, and the fact that not all tests are offered on all test dates, it is often impossible for teachers hired in September to complete the requirements within six months.
- 2.) Currently superintendents cannot hire highly qualified out-of-state candidates if any Kentucky certified teacher exists in the hiring pool, even if the superintendent has documentation that the “certified” teacher is not the best available candidate. The CTF heard many complaints from district personnel about this restriction, particularly in border counties, and the group believes the current wording does not ensure that the highest quality teachers are hired for student instruction. Use of the word *qualified* would align this statute with the requirements used for all other one-year certificates, e.g., emergency, probationary, etc.

**Recommendation X:**

Reduce the two-year teaching experience requirement for out-of-state teachers to one year in order to waive KTIP and Kentucky assessment requirements.

Rationale:

This recommendation was recently made by the EPSB’s KTIP Task Force, and the CTF is in agreement with that recommendation. The CTF believes that the reduction in this requirement would benefit districts in recruiting experienced out-of-state teachers, and it would not diminish Kentucky’s teacher quality efforts. Because Kentucky borders seven states, there is an ongoing problem, particularly among border counties, in attracting and/or retaining teachers from out of state.

**EMERGENCY CERTIFICATES** *(area not specifically discussed in CTF Charter)*

**Recommendation XI:**

Restrict the issuance of emergency certificates to current year only, allowing only one re-issuance in cases where the emergency certificate was issued after February 15 or was used for less than 50% of the teacher’s schedule during the first issuance.

Rationale:

The number of full emergency certificates has steadily declined over the past five years from over 2000 to under 400 in the current year. Most of the emergency certificates are used for only 1-3 classes where they are requested for a teacher already certified in another area. Full emergency certificates have been largely replaced with alternatively certified teachers; however, there are situations which do qualify as an “emergency.” During the last federal audit in Kentucky regarding the state’s NCLB compliance, the issuance of emergency certificates was questioned by the audit team. An effort to address this type of certificate and to greatly restrict its use will benefit Kentucky during its federal audit next year. Alternative certification programs, rather than emergency certificates, have given districts more options to identify and transition better candidates into the classroom.

Agenda Book  
**EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD  
STAFF NOTE**

**Action Item A**

**Action Item:**

16 KAR 5:010, Section 16: Standards for Accreditation of Educator Preparation Units and Approval of Programs, Amendment, Final Action

**Applicable Statutes and Regulation:**

KRS 161.028  
16 KAR 5:010

**Applicable Goal:**

Goal 1: Every approved educator preparation program meets or exceeds all accreditation standards and prepares knowledgeable, capable teachers and administrators who demonstrate effectiveness in helping all students reach educational achievement.

**Issue I:**

Should the Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) approve the proposed amendment to 16 KAR 5:010, Section 16 of the Standards for Accreditation of Educator Preparation Units?

**Background:**

KRS 161.028 (1) (b) stipulates that the EPSB has the responsibility to, “Set standards for, approve, and evaluate college, university, and school district programs for the preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel.” 16 KAR 5:010 Section 2 (1) (a) (b) specifies that, “An institution offering an educator certification program or a program leading to a rank change: (a) Shall be accredited by the state; and (b) May be accredited by NCATE.” 16 KAR 5:010 Section 16 (2) stipulates that the EPSB shall reimburse a state team member for travel, lodging, and meals in accordance with 200 KAR 2:006. A team member representing NCATE shall be reimbursed by the educator preparation institution.

Currently the EPSB reimburses all state BOE members, whether on a joint visit that will include national BOE members or a state-only visit that would have only state BOE members, through agency operational funds allocated by the General Assembly. Over the last few years the cost of reimbursing state BOE members has ranged from a high of \$4,826 to a low of \$1,300, with an average of \$2,937 per accreditation visit. While the annual costs vary, based on the number of accreditation visits made per year, the total cost to the EPSB for travel reimbursements for state BOE members from fall 2003 through spring 2008 has been \$67,755. An EPSB survey of 30 states revealed that Kentucky is one of seven states that bear the travel expenses for members of a state Board of Examiners (BOE) team to participate in an institution’s accreditation review.

During the June 21, 2008 EPSB summer retreat, the board discussed the need to review the current practice of using EPSB agency operational funds to reimburse state BOE

## Agenda Book

members. On September 21, 2008, the EPSB convened a Sunday evening study session to discuss the matter again. This discussion resulted in a request for staff to prepare an amendment to 16 KAR 5:010 for board review and approval.

### **Groups/Persons Consulted:**

Member States of the NCATE Partnership

### **Alternative Actions:**

1. Approve the proposed changes to 16 KAR 5:010, Section 16.
2. Do not approve the proposed changes to 16 KAR 5:010, Section 16.

### **Staff Recommendation:**

Alternative Action I

### **Rationale:**

Kentucky is the only state paying the total cost for state accreditation visits during both NCATE joint visits and state-only accreditation visits. Colleges and universities will pay the lodging, meals, and transportation for board of examiner members. The EPSB will continue to pay staff expenses to participate in accreditation visits.

### **Contact Person:**

Dr. Marilyn Troupe, Director  
Division of Educator Preparation  
(502) 564-4606  
E-mail: marilyn.troupe@ky.gov

---

**Executive Director**

### **Date:**

January 26, 2009

**16 KAR 5:010. Standards for accreditation of educator preparation units and approval of programs.**

RELATES TO: KRS 161.028, 161.030, 164.945, 164.946, 164.947, 20 U.S.C. 1021-1030

STATUTORY AUTHORITY: KRS 161.028, 161.030

NECESSITY, FUNCTION, AND CONFORMITY: KRS 161.028(1) authorizes the Education Professional Standards Board to establish standards and requirements for obtaining and maintaining a teaching certificate and for programs of preparation for teachers and other professional school personnel, and KRS 161.030(1) requires all certificates issued under KRS 161.010 to 161.126 to be issued in accordance with the administrative regulations of the board. This administrative regulation establishes the standards for accreditation of an educator preparation unit and approval of a program to prepare an educator.

Section 1. Definitions. (1) "AACTE" means the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

(2) "Biennial report" means the report prepared by the EPSB summarizing the institutionally-prepared annual reports for a two (2) year period.

(3) "Board of examiners" means the team who reviews an institution on behalf of NCATE or EPSB.

(4) "EPSB" means the Education Professional Standards Board.

(5) "NCATE" means the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

(6) "NCATE accreditation" means a process for assessing and enhancing academic and educational quality through voluntary peer review.

(7) "State accreditation" means recognition by the EPSB that an institution has a professional education unit that has met accreditation standards as a result of review, including an on-site team review.

Section 2. Accreditation Requirements. (1) An institution offering an educator certification program or a program leading to a rank change:

(a) Shall be accredited by the state; and

(b) May be accredited by NCATE.

(2) State accreditation shall be:

(a) A condition of offering an educator certification program or a program leading to a rank change; and

(b) Based on the national accreditation standards which include the program standards enumerated in KRS 161.028(1)(b), and which are set out in the "Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education" established by NCATE. The accreditation standards shall include:

1. Standard 1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions. Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

2. Standard 2 - Assessment System and Unit Evaluation. The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.

3. Standard 3 - Field Experience and Clinical Practice. The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

4. Standard 4 - Diversity. The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools.

5. Standard 5 - Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development. Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

6. Standard 6 - Unit Governance and Resources. The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

(3) NCATE accreditation shall not be a condition of offering an educator certification program or a program leading to a rank change.

(4) All educator preparation institutions and programs operating in Kentucky that require licensure by the Council on Postsecondary Education under KRS 164.945, 164.946, 164.947, and 13 KAR 1:020 shall:

(a) Be accredited by the state through the EPSB under this administrative regulation as a condition of offering an educator certification program or a program leading to rank change; and

(b) Comply with the EPSB "Accreditation of Preparation Programs Procedure".

Section 3. Developmental Process for New Educator Preparation Programs. (1) New educator preparation institutions requesting approval from the EPSB to develop educator preparation programs that do not have a historical foundation from which to show the success of candidates or graduates as required under Section 9 of this administrative regulation shall follow the four (4) stage developmental process established in this section to gain temporary authority to admit candidates.

(2) Stage One.

(a) The educator preparation institution shall submit an official letter from the chief executive officer and the governing board of the institution to the EPSB for review and acceptance by the board indicating the institution's intent to begin the developmental process establish an educator preparation program.

(b) The EPSB staff shall make a technical visit to the institution.

(c) The institution shall submit the following documentation:

1. Program descriptions required by Section 11 of this administrative regulation;

2. Continuous assessment plan required by Section 11 of this administrative regulation; and

3. Fulfillment of Preconditions 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, and 9 established in Section 9 of this administrative regulation.

(d) The EPSB shall provide for a paper review of this documentation by the Reading Committee and the Continuous Assessment Review Committee.

(e) Following review of the documentation, EPSB staff shall make an additional technical visit to the institution.

(3) Stage Two.

(a) A board of examiners team shall make a one (1) day visit to the institution to verify the paper review.

(b) The team shall be comprised of:

1. One (1) representative from a public postsecondary institution;
2. One (1) representative from an independent postsecondary institution; and
3. One (1) representative from the Kentucky Education Association.

(c) The team shall submit a written report of its findings to the EPSB.

(d) The EPSB shall provide a copy of the written report to the institution.

(e)1. The institution may submit a written rejoinder to the report within thirty (30) working days of its receipt.

2. The rejoinder may be supplemented by materials pertinent to the conclusions found in the team's report.

(f) The Accreditation Audit Committee shall review the materials gathered during Stages One and Two and make one (1) of the following recommendations to the EPSB with regards to temporary authorization:

1. Approval;

2. Approval with conditions; or

3. Denial of approval.

(4) Stage Three.

(a) The EPSB shall review the materials and recommendations from the Accreditation Audit Committee and make one (1) of the following determinations with regards to temporary authorization:

1. Approval;

2. Approval with conditions; or

3. Denial of approval.

(b) An institution receiving approval or approval with conditions shall:

1. Hold this temporary authorization for two (2) years; and

2. Continue the developmental process and the first accreditation process established in this administrative regulation.

(c) An institution denied temporary authorization may reapply.

(d) During the two (2) year period of temporary authorization, the institution shall:

1. Admit candidates;

2. Monitor, evaluate, and assess the academic and professional competency of candidates; and

3. Report regularly to the EPSB on the institution's progress.

(e) During the two (2) year period of temporary authorization, the EPSB:

1. May schedule additional technical visits; and

2. Shall monitor progress by paper review of annual reports, admission and exit data, and trend data.

(5) Stage Four.

(a) The institution shall host a first accreditation visit within two (2) years of the approval or approval with conditions of temporary authorization.

(b) All further accreditation activities shall be governed by Section 9 of this administrative regulation.

Section 4. Schedule and Communications. (1) The EPSB shall send an accreditation and program approval schedule to each educator preparation institution no later than August 1 of each year. The first accreditation cycle shall provide for an on-site continuing accreditation visit at a five (5) year interval. The regular accreditation cycle shall provide for an on-site continuing accreditation visit at a seven (7) year interval.

(2) The accreditation and program approval schedule shall be directed to the official designated by the institution as the head of the educator preparation unit with a copy to the president. The head of the educator preparation unit shall disseminate the information to administrative units within the institution, including the appropriate college, school, department, and office.

(3) The EPSB shall annually place a two (2) year schedule of on-site accreditation visits for a Kentucky institution in the agenda materials and minutes of an EPSB business meeting.

(4) The EPSB shall coordinate dates for a joint state and NCATE accreditation on-site visit.

(5) At least six (6) months prior to a scheduled on-site visit, an institution seeking NCATE or state accreditation shall give public notice of the upcoming visit.

(6) The governance unit for educator preparation shall be responsible for the preparation necessary to comply with the requirements for timely submission of materials for accreditation and program approval as established in this administrative regulation.

Section 5. Annual Reports. (1)(a) Each institution shall report annually to the EPSB to provide data about:

1. Faculty and students in each approved program;

2. Progress made in addressing areas for improvement identified by its last accreditation evaluation; and

3. Major program developments in each NCATE standard.

(b)1. An institution seeking accreditation from NCATE and EPSB shall complete the Professional Educator Data System (PEDS) sponsored by AACTE and NCATE and located online at <http://www.aacte.org>. After the PEDS is submitted electronically, the institution shall print a copy of the completed report and mail it to the EPSB at 100 Airport Road, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601.

2. An institution seeking state-only accreditation shall complete the Annual State-Only Institutional Data Report online at <http://www.kyepsb.net/teacherprep/index.asp> and submit it electronically to the division contact through the EPSB Web site.

(2)(a) The EPSB shall review each institution's annual report to monitor the capacity of a unit to continue a program of high quality.

(b) The EPSB may pursue action against the unit based on data received in this report.

(3) The Accreditation Audit Committee shall submit a biennial report, based on data submitted in the annual reports, to the unit head in preparation for an on-site accreditation visit.

Section 6. Content Program Review Committee. (1)(a) The EPSB shall appoint and train a content program review committee in each of the certificate areas to provide content area expertise to EPSB staff and the Reading Committee.

(b) Nominations for the content program review committees shall be solicited from the education constituent groups listed in Section 13 of this administrative regulation.

(2)(a) A content program review committee shall review an educator preparation program to establish congruence of the program with standards of nationally-recognized specialty program associations and appropriate state performance standards.

(b) A content program review committee shall examine program content and faculty expertise.

(3) A content program review committee shall submit written comments to EPSB staff and the Reading Committee for use in the program approval process.

(4) A content program review committee shall not make any determination or decision regarding the approval or denial of a program.

Section 7. Continuous Assessment Review Committee. (1) The EPSB shall appoint and train a Continuous Assessment Review Committee to be comprised of P-12 and postsecondary faculty who have special expertise in the field of assessment.

(2) The Continuous Assessment Review Committee shall conduct a preliminary review of each institution's continuous assessment plan.

(3) The Continuous Assessment Review Committee shall meet in the spring and fall semesters of each year to analyze the continuous assessment plan for those institutions that are within one (1) year of their on-site visit.

(4) The Continuous Assessment Review Committee shall provide technical assistance to requesting institutions in the design, development, and implementation of the continuous assessment plan.

Section 8. Reading Committee. (1) The EPSB shall appoint and train a Reading Committee representative of the constituent groups to the EPSB.

(2) The Reading Committee shall conduct a preliminary review of accreditation materials, annual reports, and program review documents from an educator preparation institution for adequacy, timeliness, and conformity with the corresponding standards.

(3) For first accreditation, the Reading Committee shall:

(a) Review the preconditions documents prepared by the institution; and

(b) Send to the EPSB a preconditions report indicating whether a precondition has been satisfied by documentation. If a precondition has not been met, the institution shall be asked to revise or send additional documentation. A preconditions report stating that the preconditions have been met shall be inserted into the first section of the institutional report.

(4) For continuing accreditation and program approval, the Reading Committee shall:

(a) Determine that a submitted material meets requirements;

(b) Ask that EPSB staff resolve with the institution a discrepancy or omission in the report or program;

(c) Refer an unresolved discrepancy or omission to the on-site accreditation team for resolution; or

(d) Recommend that the evaluation and approval process be terminated as a result of a severe deficiency in the submitted material.

(5) The EPSB shall discuss a recommendation for termination with the originating institution. The institution may submit a written response which shall be presented, with the Reading Committee comments and written accreditation and program, by EPSB staff for recommendation to the full EPSB.

Section 9. Preconditions for First Unit Accreditation. (1) Eighteen (18) months prior to the scheduled on-site visit of the evaluation team, the educator preparation institution shall submit information to the EPSB, and to NCATE if appropriate, documenting the fulfillment of the preconditions for the accreditation of the educator preparation unit, as established in subsection (2) of this section.

(2) As a precondition for experiencing an on-site first evaluation for educator preparation, the institution shall present documentation to show that the following conditions are satisfied:

(a) Precondition Number 1. The institution recognizes and identifies a professional education unit that has responsibility and authority for the preparation of teachers and other professional education personnel. Required documentation shall include:

1. A letter from the institution's chief executive officer that designates the unit as having primary authority and responsibility for professional education programs;

2. A chart or narrative that lists all professional education programs offered by the institution, including any nontraditional and alternative programs. The chart or narrative report shall depict:

- a. The degree or award levels for each program;
- b. The administrative location for each program; and

c. The structure or structures through which the unit implements its oversight of all programs;

3. If the unit's offerings include off-campus programs, a separate chart or narrative as described in subparagraph 2 of this paragraph, prepared for each location at which off-campus programs are geographically located; and

4. An organizational chart of the institution that depicts the professional education unit and indicates the unit's relationship to other administrative units within the college or university.

(b) Precondition Number 2. A dean, director, or chair is officially designated as head of the unit and is assigned the authority and responsibility for its overall administration and operation. The institution shall submit a job description for the head of the professional education unit.

(c) Precondition Number 3. Written policies and procedures guide the operations of the unit. Required documentation shall include cover page and table of contents for codified policies, bylaws, procedures, and student handbooks.

(d) Precondition Number 4. The unit has a well-developed conceptual framework that establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work in P-12 schools and provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. Required documentation shall include:

1. The vision and mission of the institution and the unit;

2. The unit's philosophy, purposes, and goals;

3. Knowledge bases including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and education policies, that inform the unit's conceptual framework;

4. Candidate proficiencies aligned with the expectations in professional, state, and institutional standards; and

5. A description of the system by which the candidate proficiencies described are regularly assessed.

(e) Precondition Number 5. The unit regularly monitors and evaluates its operations, the quality of its offerings, the performance of candidates, and the effectiveness of its graduates. Required documentation shall include a description of the unit's assessment and data collection systems that support unit responses to Standards 1 and 2 established in Section 2(2)(b)1 and 2 of this administrative regulation.

(f) Precondition Number 6. The unit has published criteria for admission to and exit from all initial teacher preparation and advanced programs and can provide summary reports of candidate performance at exit. Required documentation shall include:

1. A photocopy of published documentation (e.g., from a catalog, student teaching handbook, application form, or web page) listing the basic requirements for entry to, retention in, and completion of professional education programs offered by the institution, including any nontraditional, alternative or off-campus programs; and

2. A brief summary of candidate performance on assessments conducted for admission into programs and exit from them. This summary shall include:

a. The portion of Title II documentation related to candidate admission and completion that was prepared for the state; and

b. A compilation of results on the unit's own assessments.

(g) Precondition Number 7. The unit's programs are approved by the appropriate state agency or agencies and the unit's summary pass rate meets or exceeds the required state pass rate of eighty (80) percent. Required documentation shall include:

1. The most recent approval letters from the EPSB and CPE, including or appended by a list of approved programs. If any program is not approved, the unit shall provide a statement that it is not currently accepting new applicants into the nonapproved program or programs. For programs that are approved with qualifications or are pending approval, the unit shall describe how it will bring the program or programs into compliance; and

2. Documentation submitted to the state for Title II, indicating that the unit's summary pass rate on state licensure examinations meets or exceeds the required state pass rate of eighty (80) percent. If the required state pass rate is not evident on this documentation, it shall be provided on a separate page.

(h) Precondition Number 8. If the institution has chosen to pursue dual accreditation from both the state and NCATE and receive national recognition for a program or programs, the institution shall submit its programs for both state and national review.

(i) Precondition Number 9. The institution is accredited, without probation or an equivalent status, by the appropriate regional institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Department of Education. Required documentation shall include a copy of the current regional accreditation letter or report that indicates institutional accreditation status.

Section 10. Institutional Report. (1) For a first accreditation visit, the educator preparation unit shall submit, two (2) months prior to the scheduled on-site visit, a written narrative describing the unit's conceptual framework and evidence that demonstrates the

six (6) standards are met. The written narrative may be supplemented by a chart, graph, diagram, table, or other similar means of presenting information. The institutional report, including appendices, shall not exceed 100 pages in length. The report shall be submitted to the EPSB and to NCATE, if appropriate.

(2) For a continuing accreditation visit, the educator preparation unit shall submit, two (2) months prior to the scheduled on-site visit, a report not to exceed 100 pages addressing changes at the institution that have occurred since the last accreditation visit, a description of the unit's conceptual framework, and evidence that demonstrates that the six (6) standards are met. The narrative shall describe how changes relate to an accreditation standard and the results of the continuous assessment process, including program evaluation. The report shall be submitted to the EPSB and to NCATE, if appropriate.

Section 11. Program Review Documents. Eighteen (18) months for first accreditation and twelve (12) months for continuing accreditation in advance of the scheduled on-site evaluation visit, the educator preparation unit shall prepare and submit to the EPSB for each separate program of educator preparation for which the institution is seeking approval a concise description which shall provide the following information:

(1) The unit's conceptual framework for the preparation of school personnel which includes:

(a) The mission of the institution and unit;

(b) The unit's philosophy, purposes, professional commitments, and dispositions;

(c) Knowledge bases, including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and education policies;

(d) Performance expectations for candidates, aligning the expectations with professional, state, and institutional standards; and

(e) The system by which candidate performance is regularly assessed;

(2) The unit's continuous assessment plan that provides:

(a) An overview of how the unit will implement continuous assessment to assure support and integration of the unit's conceptual framework;

(b) Each candidate's mastery of content prior to exit from the program, incorporating the assessment of the appropriate performance standards;

(c) Assessment of the program that includes specific procedures used to provide feedback and make recommendations to the program and unit; and

(d) A monitoring plan for candidates from admission to exit;

(3) Program experiences including the relationship among the program's courses and experiences, content standards of the relevant national specialty program associations (e.g., National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, National Council for the Social Studies, The Council for Exceptional Children, North American Association for Environmental Education, etc.), student academic expectations as established in 703 KAR 4:060, and relevant state performance standards established in 16 KAR 1:010 or incorporated by reference into this administrative regulation including:

(a) NCATE Unit Standards;

(b) Kentucky's Safety Educator Standards for Preparation and Certification;

(c) National Association of School Psychologists, Standards for School Psychology Training Programs, Field Placement Programs, Credentialing Standards; and

(d) Kentucky's Standards for Guidance Counseling Programs;

(4)(a) Identification of how the program integrates the unit's continuous assessment to assure each candidate's mastery, prior to exit from the program, of content of the academic discipline, and state performance standards as established in 16 KAR 1:010; and

(b) Identification of how the program utilizes performance assessment to assure that each candidate's professional growth is consistent with the Kentucky Teacher Standards as established in 16 KAR 1:010;

(5) A list of faculty responsible for and involved with the conduct of the specific program, along with the highest degree of each, responsibilities for the program, and status of employment within the unit and the university; and

(6) A curriculum guide sheet or contract provided to each candidate before or at the time of admittance to the program.

Section 12. Teacher Leader Master's Programs and Planned Fifth-Year Programs for Rank II. (1) All master's programs for rank change or planned fifth-year program for Rank II approved or accredited by the EPSB prior to May 31, 2008 shall no longer be approved or accredited as of December 31, 2010.

(a) Master's programs for initial certification shall be exempt from the requirements of this section.

(b) A master's program or planned fifth-year program for Rank II approved by the EPSB prior to May 31, 2008 shall cease admitting new candidates after December 31, 2010.

(c) Candidates admitted to a master's program or planned fifth-year program for Rank II approved by the EPSB prior to May 31, 2008 shall complete the program by January 31, 2013.

(d) An institution of higher learning with a master's program or a planned fifth-year program for Rank II approved by the EPSB prior to May 31, 2008 may submit a redesigned program for approval pursuant to the requirements of subsection (2) of this section beginning May 31, 2008.

(e) An institution may become operational beginning January 1, 2009, if the institution:

1. Submits a redesigned master's program or a planned fifth-year program for Rank II for review pursuant to the requirements of subsection (2) of this section; and

2. Receives approval of the redesigned program by the EPSB pursuant to Section 22 of this administrative regulation.

(f) Institutions submitting a redesigned master's program or planned fifth-year program for Rank II shall not be subject to any submission dates for program approval until December 31, 2010.

(g)1. The EPSB shall appoint a Master's Redesign Review Committee to conduct reviews of redesigned master's programs and planned fifth-year programs for Rank II submitted for approval between May 31, 2008 and December 31, 2010.

2. A master's program or a planned fifth-year program for Rank II submitted for approval between May 31, 2008 and December 31, 2010 shall not be reviewed by the Continuous Assessment Review Committee, Content Program Review Committee, or the Reading Committee prior to presentation to the EPSB pursuant to Section 22(2) of this

administrative regulation, but shall be reviewed by the Master's Redesign Review Committee.

3.a. After review of a master's program or planned fifth-year program for Rank II, the Master's Redesign Review Committee shall issue one (1) of the following recommendations to the Educational Professional Standards Board:

- i. Approval;
- ii. Approval with conditions; or
- iii. Denial of approval.

b. The EPSB shall consider recommendations from staff and the Master's Redesign Review Committee and shall issue a decision pursuant to Section 22(4) of this administrative regulation.

(2)Beginning May 31, 2008, the educator preparation unit shall prepare and submit to the EPSB for each separate master's program or planned fifth-year program for Rank II for which the institution is seeking approval a concise description which shall provide the following information:

(a) Program design components which shall include the following descriptions and documentation of:

1. The unit's plan to collaborate with school districts to design courses, professional development, and job-embedded professional experiences that involve teachers at the elementary, middle, and secondary levels;

2. The unit's collaboration plan with the institution's Arts and Science faculty to meet the academic and course accessibility needs of candidates;

3. The unit's process to individualize a program to meet the candidate's professional growth or improvement plan;

4. The unit's method to incorporate interpretation and analysis of annual P-12 student achievement data into the program; and

5. The institution's plan to facilitate direct service to the collaborating school districts by education faculty members.

(b) Program curriculum that shall include core component courses designed to prepare candidates to:

1. Be leaders in their schools and districts;

2. Evaluate high-quality research on student learning and college readiness;

3. Deliver differentiated instruction for P-12 students based on continuous assessment of student learning and classroom management;

4. Gain expertise in content knowledge, as applicable;

5. Incorporate reflections that inform best practice in preparing P-12 students for postsecondary opportunities;

6. Support P-12 student achievement in diverse settings;

7. Enhance instructional design utilizing the Program of Studies, Core Content for Assessment, and college readiness standards;

8. Provide evidence of candidate mastery of Kentucky Teacher Standards utilizing advanced level performances and Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) Standards if applicable; and

9. Design and conduct professionally relevant research projects; and

(c) The unit's continuous assessment plan that includes, in addition to the requirements of Section 11(2) of this administrative regulation:

1. Instruments to document and evaluate candidate ability to demonstrate impact on P-12 student learning;

2. Clinical experiences and performance activities; and

3. A description of a culminating performance-based assessment.

(3)(a) A master's program for rank change approved pursuant to this section shall be known as a Teacher Leader Master's Program.

(b) Upon completion of a Teacher Leader Master's Program and recommendation of the institution, a candidate may apply to the EPSB for a Teacher Leader endorsement.

(c)1. An institution with an approved Teacher Leader Master's Program may establish an endorsement program of teacher leadership coursework for any candidate who received a Master's degree at an out of state institution or who received a master's degree from a Kentucky program approved prior to May 31, 2008..

2. Upon completion of the teacher leadership course work and recommendation of the institution, a candidate who has received a master's degree at an out of state institution or a master's degree from a Kentucky program approved prior to May 31, 2008, may apply to the EPSB for a Teacher Leader endorsement.

Section 13. Board of Examiners. (1) A Board of Examiners shall:

(a) Be recruited and appointed by the EPSB. The board shall be comprised of an equal number of representatives from three (3) constituent groups:

1. Teacher educators;

2. P-12 teachers and administrators; and

3. State and local policymaker groups; and

(b) Include at least thirty-six (36) members representing the following constituencies;

1. Kentucky Education Association, at least ten (10) members;

2. Kentucky Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, at least ten (10) members;

and

3. At least ten (10) members nominated by as many of the following groups as may wish to submit a nomination:

a. Kentucky Association of School Administrators;

b. Persons holding positions in occupational education;

c. Kentucky Branch National Congress of Parents and Teachers;

d. Kentucky School Boards Association;

e. Kentucky Association of School Councils;

f. Kentucky Board of Education;

g. Kentucky affiliation of a national specialty program association;

h. Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence;

i. Partnership for Kentucky Schools; and

j. Subject area specialists in the Kentucky Department of Education.

(2) An appointment shall be for a period of four (4) years. A member may serve an additional term if renominated and reappointed in the manner prescribed for membership.

A vacancy shall be filled by the EPSB as it occurs.

(3) A member of the Board of Examiners and a staff member of the EPSB responsible for educator preparation and approval of an educator preparation program shall be trained by NCATE or trained in an NCATE-approved state program.

(4) The EPSB shall select and appoint for each scheduled on-site accreditation a team of examiners giving consideration to the number and type of programs offered by the institution. Team appointments shall be made at the beginning of the academic year for each scheduled evaluation visit. A replacement shall be made as needed.

(5) For an institution seeking NCATE accreditation, the EPSB and NCATE shall arrange for the joint Board of Examiners to be co chaired by an NCATE appointed team member and a state team chair appointed by the EPSB. The joint Board of Examiners shall be composed of a majority of NCATE appointees in the following proportions, respectively: NCATE and state - six (6) and five (5), five (5) and four (4), four (4) and three (3), three (3) and two (2). The size of the Board of Examiners shall depend upon the size of the institution and the number of programs to be evaluated.

(6) For an institution seeking state-only accreditation, the EPSB shall appoint a chair from a pool of trained Board of Examiners members.

(7) For state-only accreditation, the Board of Examiners shall have six (6) members.

(8) The EPSB shall make arrangements for the release time of a Board of Examiner member from his place of employment for an accreditation visit.

Section 14. Assembly of Records and Files for the Evaluation Team. For convenient access, the institution shall assemble, or make available, records and files of written materials which supplement the institutional report and which may serve as further documentation. The records and files shall include:

(1) The faculty handbook;

(2) Agenda, list of participants, and products of a meeting, workshop, or training session related to a curriculum and governance group impacting professional education;

- (3) Faculty vitae or resumes;
- (4) A random sample of graduates' transcripts;
- (5) Conceptual framework documents;
- (6) A curriculum program, rejoinder, or specialty group response that was submitted as a part of the program review process;
- (7) Course syllabi;
- (8) Policies, criteria and student records related to admission and retention;
- (9) Samples of students' portfolios and other performance assessments;
- (10) Record of performance assessments of candidate progress and summary of results including a program change based on continuous assessment;
- (11) Student evaluations, including student teaching and internship performance; and
- (12) Data on performance of graduates, including results of state licensing examinations and job placement rates.

Section 15. Previsit to the Institution. No later than one (1) month prior to the scheduled on-site evaluation visit, the EPSB shall conduct a previsit to the institution to make a final review of the arrangements. For an NCATE-accredited institution, the previsit shall be coordinated with NCATE.

Section 16. On-site Accreditation Visit. (1) At least one (1) staff member of the EPSB shall be assigned as support staff and liaison during the accreditation visit.

(2) The educator preparation institution [EPSB] shall reimburse a state team member for travel, lodging, and meals in accordance with 200 KAR 2:006. A team member representing NCATE shall be reimbursed by the educator preparation institution.

(3) The evaluation team shall conduct an on-site evaluation of the self-study materials prepared by the institution and seek out additional information, as needed, to make a determination as to whether the standards were met for the accreditation of the institution's educator preparation unit and for the approval of an individual educator preparation program. The evaluation team shall make use of the analyses prepared through the preliminary review process.

(4)(a) An off-campus site which offers a self-standing program shall require a team review. If additional team time is required for visiting an off-campus site, the team chair, the institution, and the EPSB shall negotiate special arrangements.

(b) Off-campus programs shall be:

1. Considered as part of the unit and the unit shall be accredited, not the off-campus programs; and
2. Approved in accordance with Section 28 of this administrative regulation.

(5) In a joint team, all Board of Examiners members shall vote on whether the educator preparation institution has met the six (6) NCATE standards. A determination about each standard shall be limited to the following options:

- (a) Met;
- (b) Met, with one (1) or more defined areas for improvement; or
- (c) Not met.

(6)(a) The Board of Examiners shall review each program and cite the areas for improvement for each, if applicable.

(b) The Board of Examiners shall define the areas for improvement in its report.

(7) The processes established in subsections (5) and (6) of this section shall be the same for first and continuing accreditation.

(8) The on-site evaluation process shall end with a brief oral report:

(a) By the NCATE team chair and state team chair for a joint state/NCATE visit; or

(b) By the state team chair for a state-only visit.

Section 17. Preparation and Distribution of the Evaluation Report. (1) For a state-only visit, the evaluation report shall be prepared and distributed as follows:

(a) The EPSB staff shall collect the written evaluation pages from each Board of Examiners member before leaving the institution.

(b) The first draft shall be typed and distributed to Board of Examiners members.

(c) A revision shall be consolidated by the Board of Examiners chair who shall send the next draft to the unit head to review for factual accuracy.

(d) The unit head shall submit written notification to the EPSB confirming receipt of the draft.

(e) The unit head shall submit to the EPSB and Board of Examiners chair within ten (10) working days either:

1. A written correction to the factual information contained in the report; or

2. Written notification that the unit head has reviewed the draft and found no factual errors.

(f) The Board of Examiners chair shall submit the final report to the EPSB and a copy to each member of the Board of Examiners.

(g) The final report shall be printed by the EPSB and sent to the institution and to the Board of Examiners members within thirty (30) to sixty (60) working days of the conclusion of the on-site visit.

(2) For a joint state/NCATE visit, the evaluation report shall be prepared and distributed as follows:

(a) The NCATE chair shall be responsible for the preparation, editing and corrections to the NCATE report.

(b) The state chair shall be responsible for the preparation, editing and corrections of the state report in the same manner established in subsection (1) of this section for a state-only visit.

(c) The EPSB Board of Examiners report for state/NCATE continuing accreditation visits shall be prepared in accordance with the Board of Examiners Report Format for State/NCATE Accreditation Visits.

Section 18. Institutional Response to the Evaluation Report. (1)(a) The institution shall acknowledge receipt of the evaluation report within thirty (30) working days of receipt of the report.

(b) If desired, the institution shall submit within thirty (30) working days of receipt of the report a written rejoinder to the report which may be supplemented by materials pertinent to a conclusion found in the evaluation report.

(c) The rejoinder and the Board of Examiners report shall be the primary documents reviewed by the Accreditation Audit Committee and EPSB.

(d) An unmet standard or area of improvement statement cited by the team may be recommended for change or removal by the Accreditation Audit Committee or by the

EPSB because of evidence presented in the rejoinder. The Accreditation Audit Committee or the EPSB shall not be bound by the Board of Examiners decision and may reach a conclusion different from the Board of Examiners or NCATE.

(2) If a follow-up report is prescribed through accreditation with conditions, the institution shall follow the instructions that are provided with the follow-up report.

(3) If the institution chooses to appeal a part of the evaluation results, the procedure established in Section 24 of this administrative regulation shall be followed.

(4) The institution shall make an annual report relating to the unit for educator preparation and relating to the programs of preparation as required by Section 5 of this administrative regulation.

Section 19. Accreditation Audit Committee. (1) The Accreditation Audit Committee shall be a committee of the EPSB, and shall report to the full EPSB. The EPSB shall appoint the Accreditation Audit Committee as follows:

(a) One (1) lay member;

(b) Two (2) classroom teachers, appointed from nominees provided by the Kentucky Education Association;

(c) Two (2) teacher education representatives, one (1) from a state-supported institution and one (1) from an independent educator preparation institution, appointed from nominees provided by the Kentucky Association of Colleges for Teacher Education; and

(d) Two (2) school administrators appointed from nominees provided by the Kentucky Association of School Administrators.

(2) The chairperson of the EPSB shall designate a member of the Accreditation Audit Committee to serve as its chairperson.

(3) An appointment shall be for a period of four (4) years except that three (3) of the initial appointments shall be for a two (2) year term. A member may serve an additional term if renominated and reappointed in the manner established for membership. A vacancy shall be filled as it occurs in a manner consistent with the provisions for initial appointment.

(4) A member of the Accreditation Audit Committee shall be trained by NCATE or in NCATE-approved training.

(5) Following an on-site accreditation visit, the Accreditation Audit Committee shall review the reports and materials constituting an institutional self-study, the report of the evaluation team, and the institutional response to the evaluation report. The committee shall then prepare a recommendation for consideration by the EPSB.

(a) The committee shall review procedures of the Board of Examiners to determine whether approved accreditation guidelines were followed.

(b) For each institution, the committee shall make a recommendation with respect to the accreditation of the institutional unit for educator preparation as well as for approval of the individual programs of preparation.

(c) For first accreditation, one (1) of four (4) recommendations shall be made:

1. Accreditation;
2. Provisional accreditation;
3. Denial of accreditation; or
4. Revocation of accreditation.

(d) For regular continuing accreditation, one (1) of four (4) recommendations shall be made:

1. Accreditation;
2. Accreditation with conditions;
3. Accreditation with probation; or
4. Revocation of accreditation.

(6) For both first and continuing accreditation, the Accreditation Audit Committee shall review each program report including a report from the Reading Committee, Board of Examiners team, and institutional response and shall make one (1) of three (3) recommendations for each individual preparation program to the EPSB:

- (a) Approval;
- (b) Approval with conditions; or
- (c) Denial of approval.

(7) The Board of Examiners Team Chair may write a separate response to the recommendation of the Accreditation Audit Committee's if the Accreditation Audit Committee's decision differs from the Board of Examiners' evaluation report.

(8) The Accreditation Audit Committee shall compile accreditation data and information for each Kentucky institution that prepares school personnel. It shall prepare for the EPSB reports and recommendations regarding accreditation standards and procedures as needed to improve the accreditation process and the preparation of school personnel.

Section 20. Official State Accreditation Action by the Education Professional Standards Board. (1) A recommendation from the Accreditation Audit Committee shall be presented to the full EPSB.

(2) The EPSB shall consider the findings and recommendations of the Accreditation Audit Committee and make a final determination regarding the state accreditation of the educator preparation unit.

(3) Decision options following a first accreditation visit shall include:

(a) Accreditation.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit meets each of the six (6) NCATE standards for unit accreditation. Areas for improvement may be cited, indicating problems warranting the institution's attention. In its subsequent annual reports, the professional education unit shall be expected to describe progress made in addressing the areas for improvement cited in the EPSB's action report.

2. The next on-site visit shall be scheduled five (5) years following the semester of the visit;

(b) Provisional accreditation.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not met one (1) or more of the NCATE standards. The unit has accredited status but shall satisfy provisions by meeting each previously-unmet standard. EPSB shall require submission of documentation that addresses the unmet standard or standards within six (6) months of the accreditation decision, or shall schedule a visit focused on the unmet standard or standards within two (2) years of the semester that the provisional accreditation decision was granted. If the EPSB decides to require submission of documentation, the institution

may choose to waive that option in favor of the focused visit within two (2) years.

Following the focused visit, the EPSB shall decide to:

- a. Accredited; or
- b. Revoke accreditation.

2. If the unit is accredited, the next on-site visit shall be scheduled for five (5) years following the semester of the first accreditation visit;

(c) Denial of accreditation. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit does not meet one (1) or more of the NCATE standards, and has pervasive problems that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates; or

(d) Revocation of accreditation. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not sufficiently addressed the unmet standard or standards following a focused visit.

(4) Decision options following a continuing accreditation visit shall include:

(a) Accreditation.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit meets each of the six (6) NCATE standards for unit accreditation. Areas for improvement may be cited, indicating problems warranting the institution's attention. In its subsequent annual reports, the professional education unit shall be expected to describe progress made in addressing the areas for improvement cited in EPSB's action report.

2. The next on-site visit shall be scheduled for seven (7) years following the semester of the visit;

(b) Accreditation with conditions.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not met one (1) or more of the NCATE standards. If the EPSB renders this decision, the unit shall maintain its

accredited status, but shall satisfy conditions by meeting previously unmet standards. EPSB shall require submission of documentation that addresses the unmet standard or standards within six (6) months of the decision to accredit with conditions, or shall schedule a visit focused on the unmet standard or standards within two (2) years of the semester that the accreditation with conditions decision was granted. If the EPSB decides to require submission of documentation, the institution may choose to waive that option in favor of the focused visit within two (2) years. Following the focused visit, the EPSB shall decide to:

- a. Continue accreditation; or
- b. Revoke accreditation.

2. If the EPSB renders the decision to continue accreditation, the next on-site visit shall be scheduled for seven (7) years following the semester in which the continuing accreditation visit occurred;

- (c) Accreditation with probation.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not met one (1) or more of the NCATE standards and has pervasive problems that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates. As a result of the continuing accreditation review, the EPSB has determined that areas for improvement with respect to standards may place an institution's accreditation in jeopardy if left uncorrected. The institution shall schedule an on-site visit within two (2) years of the semester in which the probationary decision was rendered. This visit shall mirror the process for first accreditation. The unit as part of this visit shall address all NCATE standards in effect at

the time of the probationary review at the two (2) year point. Following the on-site review, the EPSB shall decide to:

- a. Continue accreditation; or
- b. Revoke accreditation.

2. If accreditation is continued, the next on-site visit shall be scheduled for five (5) years after the semester of the probationary visit; or

(d) Revocation of accreditation. Following a comprehensive site visit that occurs as a result of an EPSB decision to accredit with probation or to accredit with conditions, this accreditation decision indicates that the unit does not meet one (1) or more of the NCATE standards, and has pervasive problems that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates. Accreditation shall be revoked if the unit:

1. No longer meets preconditions to accreditation, such as loss of state approval or regional accreditation;
2. Misrepresents its accreditation status to the public;
3. Falsely reports data or plagiarized information submitted for accreditation purposes; or
4. Fails to submit annual reports or other documents required for accreditation.

(5) Notification of EPSB action to revoke continuing accreditation or deny first accreditation, including failure to remove conditions, shall include notice that:

(a) The institution shall inform students currently admitted to a certification or rank program of the following:

1. A student recommended for certification or advancement in rank within the twelve (12) months immediately following the denial or revocation of state accreditation and

who applies to the EPSB within the fifteen (15) months immediately following the denial or revocation of state accreditation shall receive the certificate or advancement in rank; and

2. A student who does not meet the criteria established in subparagraph 1 of this paragraph shall transfer to a state accredited education preparation unit in order to receive the certificate or advancement in rank; and

(b) An institution for which the EPSB has denied or revoked accreditation shall seek state accreditation through completion of the first accreditation process. The on-site accreditation visit shall be scheduled by the EPSB no earlier than two (2) years following the EPSB action to revoke or deny state accreditation.

Section 21. Revocation for Cause. (1) If an area of concern or an allegation of misconduct arises in between accreditation visits, staff shall bring a complaint to the EPSB for initial review.

(2) After review of the allegations in the complaint, the EPSB may refer the matter to the Accreditation Audit Committee for further investigation.

(3)(a) Notice of the EPSB's decision to refer to the matter and the complaint shall be sent to the institution.

(b) Within thirty (30) days of receipt of the complaint, the institution shall respond to the allegations in writing and provide evidence pertaining to the allegations in the complaint to the EPSB.

(4)(a) The Accreditation Audit Committee shall review any evidence supporting the allegations and any information provided by the institution.

(b) Upon completion of the review, the Accreditation Audit Committee shall issue a report containing one (1) of the following four (4) recommendations to the EPSB:

1. Accreditation;
2. Accreditation with conditions;
3. Accreditation with probation; or
4. Revocation of accreditation.

(5) The institution shall receive a copy of the Accreditation Audit Committee's report and may file a response to the Accreditation Audit Committee's recommendation.

(6)(a) The recommendation from the Accreditation Audit Committee and the institution's response shall be presented to the EPSB.

(b) The EPSB shall consider the findings and recommendations of the Accreditation Audit Committee and make a final determination regarding the accreditation of the educator preparation unit.

Section 22. Program Approval Action Outside the First or Regular Continuing Accreditation Cycle. (1) Approval of a program shall be through the program process established in Section 11 of this administrative regulation except that a new program not submitted during the regular accreditation cycle or a program substantially revised since submission during the accreditation process shall be submitted for approval by the EPSB prior to admission of a student to the program.

(2) For a new or substantially revised program, the EPSB shall consider a recommendation by staff, including review by the Continuous Assessment Review Committee, Content Program Review Committee, and the Reading Committee.

(3) A recommendation made pursuant to subsection (2) of this section shall be presented to the full EPSB.

(4) Program approval decision options shall be:

(a) Approval, with the next review scheduled during the regular accreditation cycle unless a subsequent substantial revision is made;

(b) Approval with conditions, with a maximum of one (1) year probationary extension for correction of a specified problem to be documented through written materials or through an on-site visit. At the end of the extension, the EPSB shall decide that the documentation supports:

1. Approval; or
2. Denial of approval; or

(c) Denial of approval, indicating that a serious problem exists which jeopardizes the quality of preparation of school personnel.

(5) The EPSB shall order review of a program if it has cause to believe that the quality of preparation is seriously jeopardized. The review shall be conducted under the criteria and procedures established in the EPSB "Emergency Review of Certification Programs Procedure" policy incorporated by reference. The on-site review shall be conducted by EPSB staff and a Board of Examiners team. The review shall result in a report to which the institution may respond. The review report and institutional response shall be used by the Executive Director of the EPSB as the basis for a recommendation to the full EPSB for:

- (a) Approval;
- (b) Approval with conditions; or

(c) Denial of approval for the program.

(6) If the EPSB denies approval of a program, the institution shall notify each student currently admitted to that program of the EPSB action. The notice shall include the following information:

(a) A student recommended for certification or advancement in rank within the twelve (12) months immediately following the denial of state approval and who applies to the EPSB within the fifteen (15) months immediately following the denial of state approval shall receive the certification or advancement in rank; and

(b) A student who does not meet the criteria established in paragraph (a) of this subsection shall transfer to a state approved program in order to receive the certificate or advancement in rank.

Section 23. Public Disclosure. (1) After a unit and program approval decision becomes final, the EPSB shall prepare official notice of the action. The disclosure notice shall include the essential information provided in the official letter to the institution, including the decision on accreditation, program approval, standards not met, program areas for improvement, and dates of official action.

(2) The public disclosure shall be entered into the minutes of the board for the meeting in which the official action was taken by the EPSB.

(3) Thirty (30) days after the institution has received official notification of EPSB action, the EPSB shall on request provide a copy of the public disclosure notice to the Kentucky Education Association, the Council on Postsecondary Education, the Association of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities or other organizations or individuals.

Section 24. Appeals Process. (1) If an institution seeks appeal of a decision, the institution shall appeal within thirty (30) days of receipt of the EPSB official notification.

An institution shall appeal on the grounds that:

(a) A prescribed standard was disregarded;

(b) A state procedure was not followed; or

(c) Evidence of compliance in place at the time of the review and favorable to the institution was not considered.

(2) An ad hoc appeals board of no fewer than three (3) members shall be appointed by the EPSB chair from members of the Board of Examiners who have not had involvement with the team visit or a conflict of interest regarding the institution. The ad hoc committee shall recommend action on the appeal to the EPSB.

(3) The consideration of the appeal shall be in accordance with KRS Chapter 13B.

Section 25. Approval of Alternative Route to Certification Programs. (1) Alternative route programs authorized under KRS 161.028(1)(s) or (t) shall adhere to the educator preparation unit accreditation and program approval processes established in this administrative regulation and in the EPSB policy and procedure entitled "Approval of Alternative Route to Certification Program Offered Under KRS 161.028" as a condition of offering an educator certification program or program leading to a rank change.

(2) The EPSB shall consider a waiver upon request of the institution offering the alternative route program. The request shall be submitted in writing no later than thirty (30) days prior to the next regularly-scheduled EPSB meeting. In granting the waiver, the board shall consider the provisions of this administrative regulation and any information presented that supports a determination of undue restriction.

Section 26. In compliance with the Federal Title II Report Card State Guidelines established in 20 U.S.C. 1027 and 1028, the EPSB shall identify an educator preparation unit as:

- (1) "At-risk of low performing" if an educator preparation program has received a:
  - (a) State accreditation rating of "provisional"; or
  - (b) State accreditation rating of "accreditation with conditions"; or
- (2) "Low performing" if an educator preparation program has received a state accreditation rating of "accreditation with probation".

Section 27. The Education Professional Standards Board shall produce a state report card, which shall include:

- (1) General information on the institution and the educator preparation unit;
- (2) Contact information for the person responsible for the educator preparation unit;
- (3) Type or types of accreditation the unit holds;
- (4) Current state accreditation status of the educator preparation unit;
- (5) Year of last state accreditation visit and year of next scheduled visit;
- (6) Table of the unit's approved certification program or programs;
- (7) Tables relating the unit's total enrollment disaggregated by ethnicity and gender for the last three (3) years;
- (8) Tables relating the unit's faculty disaggregated by the number of full-time equivalents (FTE), ethnicity, and gender for the last three (3) years;
- (9) Table of the number of program completers (teachers and administrators) for the last three (3) years;
- (10) Table relating pass rates on the required assessments;

(11) Table relating pass rates for the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program;

(12) Table relating pass rates for the Kentucky Principal Internship Program (if applicable);

(13) Table indicating student teacher satisfaction with the preparation program;

(14) Table relating teacher intern satisfaction with the preparation program;

(15) Table relating new teacher (<3 years) and supervisor satisfaction with the preparation program.

Section 28. Approval of Off-site and On-line Programs. (1) Institutions in Kentucky with educator preparation programs shall seek approval from the Education Professional Standards Board before offering courses or whole programs at an off-campus site.

(a) The institution shall submit a written request to the board to begin offering courses at the off-site location describing the location and physical attributes of the off-campus site, resources to be provided, faculty and their qualifications, and a list of courses or programs to be offered.

(b) The off-site location shall be approved by the board before the institution may begin offering courses at the location.

(2)(a) Until May 31, 2008, initial and continuing on-line educator preparation programs shall be regionally or nationally accredited and accredited or approved, as applicable, by the program's state of origin.

(b) Beginning June 1, 2008, initial and continuing on-line educator preparation programs originating from outside Kentucky shall be regionally accredited, accredited or approved, as applicable, by the program's state of origin, and accredited by NCATE.

Section 29. Incorporation by Reference. (1) The following material is incorporated by reference:

(a) "Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education", 2002 Edition, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education;

(b) NCATE Unit Standards (2002 Edition), National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education;

(c) "Education Professional Standards Board Accreditation of Preparation Programs Procedure", August 2002;

(d) "Education Professional Standards Board Approval of Alternative Route to Certification Program Offered under KRS 161.028", August 2002;

(e) "Education Professional Standards Board Emergency Review of Certification Programs Procedure ", September 2003;

(f) "Kentucky's Safety Educator Standards for Preparation and Certification", May 2004;

(g) "National Association of School Psychologists, Standards for School Psychology Training Programs, Field Placement Programs, Credentialing Standards", July 2000; and

(h) "Kentucky's Standards for Guidance Counseling Programs" derived from the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP) Standards, Education Professional Standards Board, November 2004.

(2) This material may be inspected, copied, or obtained, subject to applicable copyright law, at the Education Professional Standards Board, 100 Airport Road, 3rd Floor, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601, Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

## Agenda Book

---

Date

---

Lorraine Williams, Chairperson  
Education Professional Standards Board

## Agenda Book

**PUBLIC HEARING AND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:** A public hearing on this administrative regulation shall be held on March 30, 2009 at 9:00 a.m. at the offices of the Education Professional Standards Board, 100 Airport Road, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Conference Room A, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601. Individuals interested in being heard at this hearing shall notify this agency in writing five workdays prior to the hearing, of their intent to attend. If no notification of intent to attend the hearing is received by that date, the hearing may be canceled. This hearing is open to the public. Any person who wishes to be heard will be given an opportunity to comment on the proposed administrative regulation. A transcript of the public hearing will not be made unless a written request for a transcript is made. If you do not wish to be heard at the public hearing, you may submit written comments on the proposed administrative regulation. Written comments shall be accepted until March 31, 2009. Send written notification of intent to be heard at the public hearing or written comments on the proposed administrative regulation to the contact person.

Contact person:       Alicia A. Sneed, Director of Legal Services  
  
                                  Education Professional Standards Board  
  
                                  100 Airport Road, Third Floor  
  
                                  Frankfort, KY 40601  
  
                                  (502) 564-4606  
  
                                  FAX: (502) 564-7080

## REGULATORY IMPACT ANALYSIS AND TIERING STATEMENT

Contact Person:

(1) Provide a brief summary of:

(a) What this administrative regulation does: This administrative regulation establishes the standards for accreditation of an educator preparation unit and approval of a program to prepare an educator.

(b) The necessity of this administrative regulation: This administrative regulation is necessary to alert educator preparation institutions of the requirements for accreditation and program approval.

(c) How this administrative regulation conforms to the content of the authorizing statutes: KRS 161.028(1) authorizes the Education Professional Standards Board to establish standards and requirements for obtaining and maintaining a teaching certificate and to set standards for, approve, and evaluate college, university, and school district programs for the preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel.

(d) How this administrative regulation currently assists or will assist in the effective administration of the statutes: This administrative regulation sets the standards and the review process for accreditation of educator preparation units and approval of programs.

(2) If this is an amendment to an existing administrative regulation, provide a brief summary of:

(a) How the amendment will change this existing administrative regulation: This amendment transfers responsibility for reimbursing the state accreditation board of examiner team members for travel, lodging, and meals from the Education Professional Standards Board to the institution seeking accreditation.

(b) The necessity of the amendment to this administrative regulation: The amendment is necessary because with the increase in the number of institutions seeking accreditation for educator preparation programs, the cost of financing the state visits is becoming prohibitive for the Education Professional Standards Board to continue to bear.

(c) How the amendment conforms to the content of the authorizing statutes: KRS 161.028(1) authorizes the Education Professional Standards Board to establish standards and requirements for obtaining and maintaining a teaching certificate and to set standards

for, approve, and evaluate college, university, and school district programs for the preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel.

(d) How the amendment will assist in the effective administration of the statutes: This amendment will ensure that the Education Professional Standards Board will be able to continue to conduct accreditation visits at the scheduled intervals despite any current or future budgetary crises.

(3) List the type and number of individuals, businesses, organizations, or state and local governments affected by this administrative regulation: 29 Educator Preparation Institutions and any institutions seeking future accreditation for an educator preparation program.

(4) Provide an analysis of how the entities identified in question (3) will be impacted by either the implementation of this administrative regulation, if new, or by the change, if it is an amendment, including:

(a) List the actions that each of the regulated entities identified in question (3) will have to take to comply with this administrative regulation or amendment: The 28 Educator Preparation Institutions and institutions seeking future accreditation will have to appropriately budget for the costs of reimbursing the team members for their out of pocket expenses. Since regular accreditation visits are scheduled every seven (7) years, the added cost should be easily amortized over the seven (7) year period.

(b) In complying with this administrative regulation or amendment, how much will it cost each of the entities identified in question (3): Each institution will expend an additional \$6000 per accreditation visit. This amount will vary depending on the area where the institution is located and the size of the institution's educator preparation program.

(c) As a result of compliance, what benefits will accrue to the entities identified in question (3): The educator preparation programs will benefit from the assurance that the accreditation process will continue despite any budgetary shortfalls. Institutions seeking accreditation will also benefit since the Education Professional Standards Board will not have to schedule initial accreditation visits based on budgetary constraints.

(5) Provide an estimate of how much it will cost the administrative body to implement this administrative regulation:

(a) Initially: There should be no additional cost to the Education Professional Standards Board.

(b) On a continuing basis: There should be no additional cost to the Education Professional Standards Board.

(6) What is the source of the funding to be used for the implementation and enforcement of this administrative regulation: General Fund.

(7) Provide an assessment of whether an increase in fees or funding will be necessary to implement this administrative regulation, if new, or by the change if it is an amendment: This amendment will hopefully decrease the amount of expenses necessary to conduct accreditation visits, thus offsetting the need to increase fees or request additional funding to ensure that Kentucky's educator preparation programs meet the appropriate standards.

(8) State whether or not this administrative regulation established any fees or directly or indirectly increased any fees: Although this is not a fee, this is an increase in the cost to institutions regulated by the Education Professional Standards Board. Institutions will be required to bear the cost of the out of pocket expenses of the Board of Examiner team members during the accreditation visit.

(9) TIERING: Is tiering applied? (Explain why or why not) NO, all educator preparation programs will be treated the same.



FISCAL NOTE ON STATE OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Regulation No.16 KAR 5:010

Contact Person: Alicia A. Sneed

1. Does this administrative regulation relate to any program, service, or requirements of a state or local government (including cities, counties, fire departments, or school districts)?

Yes   X   No       

If yes, complete questions 2-4.

2. What units, parts or divisions of state or local government (including cities, counties, fire departments, or school districts) will be impacted by this administrative regulation? Public colleges and universities, the Education Professional Standards Board, and the 174 school districts.

3. Identify each state or federal statute or federal regulation that requires or authorizes the action taken by the administrative regulation. KRS 161.028 and KRS 161.03.

4. Estimate the effect of this administrative regulation on the expenditures and revenues of a state or local government agency (including cities, counties, fire departments, or school districts) for the first full year the administrative regulation is to be in effect. There should be no cost to the school districts; however there will be a cost to the colleges and universities that seek initial accreditation or wish to maintain accreditation for their educator preparation programs. There should be no additional cost to the Education Professional Standards Board.

(a) How much revenue will this administrative regulation generate for the state or local government (including cities, counties, fire departments, or school districts) for the first year? No revenue will be generated.

(b) How much revenue will this administrative regulation generate for the state or local government (including cities, counties, fire departments, or school districts) for subsequent years? No revenue will be generated.

(c) How much will it cost to administer this program for the first year? There should be no cost to administer this program since the institutions will be required to directly reimburse the Board of Examiners team members.

(d) How much will it cost to administer this program for subsequent years? There should be no cost to administer this program since the institutions will be required to directly reimburse the Board of Examiners team members.

Note: If specific dollar estimates cannot be determined, provide a brief narrative to explain the fiscal impact of the administrative regulation.

## Agenda Book

Revenues (+/-): No additional revenue is anticipated.

Expenditures (+/-): Educator Preparation Institutions will have to expend an additional \$6000 every seven (7) years to maintain accreditation. This is an approximate amount and will differ depending on the location of the institution and the size of the institution's educator preparation program.

Other Explanation:

Agenda Book  
**EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD  
STAFF NOTE**

**Action Item, Waiver**

**Action Item:**

Request to waive the scheduled seven (7) year accreditation visit in Regulation 16 KAR 5:010, Section 20 Standards for Accreditation of Educator Preparation Units and Approval of Programs

**Applicable Statutes and Regulation:**

KRS 161.028; KRS 161.030  
16 KAR 5:010, Section 20

**Applicable Goal:**

Goal 1: Every approved educator preparation program meets or exceeds all accreditation standards and prepares knowledgeable, capable teachers and administrators who demonstrate effectiveness in helping all students reach educational achievement.

**Issue:**

Should the Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) waive Regulation 16 KAR 5:010, Section 20 to allow educator preparation institutions to delay accreditation visits an additional year?

**Background:**

On October 23, 2008, the Education Professional Standards Board received an email from Dr. James Cibulka, President of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The email was in response to the current financial crisis and overall economic situation that forced some institutions to ask for a delay in their upcoming accreditation visits. The NCATE Executive Board took action October 17, 2008, by “seeking permission from state partners to offer all accredited institutions the opportunity to defer their visits for one year, beginning with visits in January 2009.” Once state partners have made their decisions, NCATE will work with state consultants to reschedule accreditation visits. Institutions could decide to proceed with the accreditation visit as currently scheduled.

Exceptions to the NCATE request are institutions with focused or probationary visits or those with documentation due to remove a condition/provision. The EPSB exceptions are the following institutions: Union College is on probation; Midway College has an agreed order with a set date for its next visit. Alice Lloyd College was recently granted accreditation in September 2008 after a probationary visit and must remain on schedule for the next accreditation visit. Other exceptions are institutions in the developmental stage: St. Catharine College, Indiana Wesleyan University, and Boyce College.

On November 23, 2008, board members discussed the issue but could not make a decision until the January 2009 board meeting. Because the accreditation visit schedules

## Agenda Book

are in regulation, it is necessary to waive that section of the regulation before Kentucky can respond to the NCATE request.

The NCATE proposal addresses the accreditation visit, but some institutions have asked about delaying the submission of program proposals. Staff suggests that institutions be given the option of maintaining the same schedule for submission as currently established or resetting the schedule for program submission to match the extended accreditation visit. Each institution would be required to inform the Division of Educator Preparation (DEP) of its decision to move an accreditation visit back a year. Institutions would also need to decide the program submission date once the accreditation visit has been scheduled.

### **Alternative Actions:**

1. Approve the proposed changes to 16 KAR 5:010, Section 20.
2. Deny approval of the proposed changes to 16 KAR 5:010, Section 20.

### **Staff Recommendation:**

Alternative Action I

### **Rationale:**

The opportunity for institutions to delay NCATE visits for a year will allow staff and institutions to focus on the master's and principal program redesigns. The EPSB has other proxy measures to determine if institutions are maintaining the integrity of programs.

### **Contact Person:**

Dr. Marilyn Troupe, Director  
Division of Educator Preparation  
(502) 564-4606  
E-mail: marilyn.troupe@ky.gov

---

**Executive Director**

### **Date:**

January 26, 2009

**16 KAR 5:010. Standards for accreditation of educator preparation units and approval of programs**

RELATES TO: KRS 161.028, 161.030, 164.945, 164.946, 164.947, 20 U.S.C. 1021-1030

STATUTORY AUTHORITY: KRS 161.028, 161.030

NECESSITY, FUNCTION, AND CONFORMITY: KRS 161.028(1) authorizes the Education Professional Standards Board to establish standards and requirements for obtaining and maintaining a teaching certificate and for programs of preparation for teachers and other professional school personnel, and KRS 161.030(1) requires all certificates issued under KRS 161.010 to 161.126 to be issued in accordance with the administrative regulations of the board. This administrative regulation establishes the standards for accreditation of an educator preparation unit and approval of a program to prepare an educator.

Section 20. Official State Accreditation Action by the Education Professional Standards Board (1) A recommendation from the Accreditation Audit Committee shall be presented to the full EPSB.

(2) The EPSB shall consider the findings and recommendations of the Accreditation Audit Committee and make a final determination regarding the state accreditation of the educator preparation unit.

(3) Decision options following a first accreditation visit shall include:

(a) Accreditation.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit meets each of the six (6) NCATE standards for unit accreditation. Areas for improvement may be cited, indicating problems warranting the institution's attention. In its subsequent annual reports, the professional education unit shall be expected to describe progress made in addressing the areas for improvement cited in the EPSB's action report.

2. The next on-site visit shall be scheduled five (5) years following the semester of the visit;

(b) Provisional accreditation.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not met one (1) or more of the NCATE standards. The unit has accredited status but shall satisfy provisions by

meeting each previously-unmet standard. EPSB shall require submission of documentation that addresses the unmet standard or standards within six (6) months of the accreditation decision, or shall schedule a visit focused on the unmet standard or standards within two (2) years of the semester that the provisional accreditation decision was granted. If the EPSB decides to require submission of documentation, the institution may choose to waive that option in favor of the focused visit within two (2) years. Following the focused visit, the EPSB shall decide to:

- a. Accredited; or
- b. Revoke accreditation.

2. If the unit is accredited, the next on-site visit shall be scheduled for five (5) years following the semester of the first accreditation visit;

(c) Denial of accreditation. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit does not meet one (1) or more of the NCATE standards, and has pervasive problems that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates; or

(d) Revocation of accreditation. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not sufficiently addressed the unmet standard or standards following a focused visit.

(4) Decision options following a continuing accreditation visit shall include:

(a) Accreditation.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit meets each of the six (6) NCATE standards for unit accreditation. Areas for improvement may be cited, indicating problems warranting the institution's attention. In its subsequent annual reports, the professional education unit shall be expected to describe progress made in addressing the areas for improvement cited in EPSB's action report.

2. The next on-site visit shall be scheduled for seven (7) years following the semester of the visit;

(b) Accreditation with conditions.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not met one (1) or more of the NCATE standards. If the EPSB renders this decision, the unit shall maintain its accredited status, but shall satisfy conditions by meeting previously unmet standards. EPSB shall require submission of documentation that addresses the unmet standard or standards within six (6) months of the decision to accredit with conditions, or shall

schedule a visit focused on the unmet standard or standards within two (2) years of the semester that the accreditation with conditions decision was granted. If the EPSB decides to require submission of documentation, the institution may choose to waive that option in favor of the focused visit within two (2) years. Following the focused visit, the EPSB shall decide to:

- a. Continue accreditation; or
- b. Revoke accreditation.

2. If the EPSB renders the decision to continue accreditation, the next on-site visit shall be scheduled for seven (7) years following the semester in which the continuing accreditation visit occurred;

(c) Accreditation with probation.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not met one (1) or more of the NCATE standards and has pervasive problems that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates. As a result of the continuing accreditation review, the EPSB has determined that areas for improvement with respect to standards may place an institution's accreditation in jeopardy if left uncorrected. The institution shall schedule an on-site visit within two (2) years of the semester in which the probationary decision was rendered. This visit shall mirror the process for first accreditation. The unit as part of this visit shall address all NCATE standards in effect at the time of the probationary review at the two (2) year point. Following the on-site review, the EPSB shall decide to:

- a. Continue accreditation; or
- b. Revoke accreditation.

2. If accreditation is continued, the next on-site visit shall be scheduled for five (5) years after the semester of the probationary visit; or

(d) Revocation of accreditation. Following a comprehensive site visit that occurs as a result of an EPSB decision to accredit with probation or to accredit with conditions, this accreditation decision indicates that the unit does not meet one (1) or more of the NCATE standards, and has pervasive problems that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates. Accreditation shall be revoked if the unit:

...